

the Association is a sustaining a publication of the kind, apart from the special object, which originally suggested the idea of a Review. The Review, however, from which it has received most of its patronage, has come to occupy a position of influence among other publications of this country, and seems to

MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY REVIEW.

and wants, her origin, history, and present spirit, appear to render it necessary that in addition to her weekly periodicals, she should have one which is purely and religiously the property of the church, and at the same time important. Like other

democratical and has her own principles to solve, and questions are constantly arising which are constantly arising.

ART. I.—THE REVIEW AND THE QUARTERLY.

At the meeting of the Alumni Association of Marshall College in September last, the following question was proposed for the consideration of that body: Shall the Mercersburg Review be published another year? The more immediate causes, which led to the discussion of this question, were in the first place, the financial condition of the Review, and in the second, the fact that the Rev. Dr. Nevins, its leading contributor, or editor, upon whom it had mainly depended for character and reputation, had expressed his intention to withdraw from its editorial supervision at the close of the year. After the matter had been taken into serious consideration, the general opinion seemed to be in favor of its continuation, in case it could be carried forward without involving the Association in pecuniary difficulty; and the Publishing Committee were accordingly instructed to make provision for its publication during another year, if its accounts should be found to be in a condition to justify them in the undertaking. The withdrawal of the able and learned contributor referred to, who for the last four years had devoted much of his time and attention to its columns from a disinterested love of the truth, and given it a wide-spread celebrity, occasioned general regret, and some doubt as to the propriety of continuing its publication any longer. It had been called into existence more particularly with the view of providing some suitable organ for the discussion of certain principles, of which he had become the acknowledged representative and defender, and hence under the circumstances it was thought by some, that it was no longer called for, that it had accomplished its object, and performed its mission. There were, however, reasons that were deemed sufficient to justify

the Association in sustaining a publication of the kind, apart from the special object, which originally suggested the idea of a Review. The religious communion, from which it has received most of its patronage, has come to occupy a position of influence among other denominations of this country, and seems to require some such a Theological organ, more so now than at any previous part of her history. Her peculiar circumstances and wants, her origin, history, and general spirit, appear to render it necessary, that, in addition to her weekly periodicals, she should have some organ of a permanent character, by which her piety and religious life generally may be properly represented, and at the same time improved. Like other denominations she has her own problem to solve, and questions are constantly arising in the course of her history, intimately connected with her welfare, that could not be discussed elsewhere with so much propriety as in a journal especially devoted to her interests. The German Reformed Church is under obligation to contribute her part of the sum-total of religious influence brought to bear upon the mind of this country, and to lay her stone with her name and superscription in the monument now in the course of erection in the American Church. Her theological tendencies and affinities have a right to be heard of, known, and defended, even though Theology has become a cheap article, and the markets are already stocked with it in infinite variety. She dates her origin back to the Reformation-period, and feels herself honored by her descent from the Church of Germany, of all other churches the most theological. Hence she would indeed dishonor her name and history, if here in this country she failed to manifest some degree of interest and activity in the discussion and settlement of theological questions. Just at this time the internal struggles of the mother Church, and the herculean labors of her most gifted sons, excite every where much attention, and they have already made a deep impression on many minds in this country. The Reviews of our various religious denominations have of late bestowed much labor in bringing German Theology into notice with the view either of condemning or approving, and in many directions a desire has been awakened to understand its true character, and to arrive at a just appreciation of its value: for no one can view it in the wide extent of territory over which it ranges, without feeling that such a stupendous amount of intellectual activity must sooner or later leave its mark in the history of the Church and the world.

Germany is eminently the land of scholars, of authors, of books, and, we may say, of theologians also. Whilst other nations, such as our country and England, are devoted to outward interests, such as manufacture, commerce, or politics, she expends her chief energies in the world of thought and reflection, and there engages her master minds in intense and persevering labor. But if English and American divines rival each other in exhuming the rich treasures of German learning, and in employing them for their own uses, they, who have a claim to those treasures by the right of inheritance, may engage with much more propriety in the same work. Duty as well as self-respect would seem to require this at their hands. They may well feel themselves animated to a work of this kind by the example of others, or rather should themselves feel the first and strongest impulse to take part in it. If the Theology, of which we have spoken, have any value, then it ought by all means to be valuable to the German dispersion in this country, to persons of German origin, feelings, and sympathies; they of all others should cherish it, and be among the first to recommend it to others, or to defend it against the assaults of those who have no proper acquaintance with its character or merits. Other denominations have created for themselves organs, of which they avail themselves in calling attention to their histories, and in holding up for imitation the bright names which adorn their annals. The Presbyterian and the Puritan point us to Scotland and England for instruction, and pride themselves on the piety and learning of their ancestors: they thus manifest a filial reverence for the Churches from which they spring. It would be, therefore, anomalous, if German churches, or clergymen in this country, should so far forget themselves as to take no interest in cultivating, or holding up to view, what is truly valuable in the Theology of the fatherland, and in this way turning it to practical account for themselves and others.

It is therefore believed that the Reformed Church at the present time needs a Review; that such a journal in her midst has a distinct and important field to cultivate, and that it may be made productive of much good to the interests of the Church and of true religion. Her ministry and laity, so far as an opportunity has been enjoyed to consult them, have generally expressed an earnest desire to have the present publication continued. As long, accordingly, as her Synod does not see proper to establish an organ of this kind to be strictly

denominational, it may be taken for granted that she is satisfied with the present journal, and those who have been more intimately concerned in carrying it forward, will not for a moment feel that they are seeking a patronage which is not freely accorded.

But whilst the circumstances of a large and influential religious communion seem to call honestly and sincerely for the present publication, the association of young men, who originally called it into existence, feel that their intellectual and spiritual wants may be promoted by it at the same time. The Alumni of Marshall College, and such as were formerly connected with that Institution, temporarily as students, have already become a large body, and scattered over every part of the country, are rising to eminence and usefulness in their various callings or professions. It is impossible that they should very soon forget their literary associates, or cease to take interest in the promotion of literary objects. The impressions made upon their minds during their college-days, as is the case with students generally, must necessarily remain. Neither time, nor distance can erase them. The ties, which bind them together and to their Alma Mater, are rather strengthened than diminished by intervening years; for time and distance in their cases have this advantage, that they cover over the difficulties and rivalries of college life with the mantle of oblivion, and leave in prominent view the brighter parts of that season as green oases on the plain of memory. This is exemplified when after the lapse of years they meet each other on the thoroughfares of life. There are few whose hearts at such times have not leaped for joy as they grasp the hand of an old college-friend after years of separation. Commencement-Days, when old students revisit the scenes hallowed by many interesting associations, and meet their early friends and preceptors around the same literary board, are occasions full of reason and soul, and serve to round off the sharp angles of life with a pure enjoyment. There are many ligaments that must forever bind the students of Marshall College together as one body. Their collegiate training has been all along in some respects peculiar. From the beginning the systems of Metaphysics and Philosophy, which they were taught, were not the same as those which are admired by most persons who speak the English language. Locke was never held up to their view as the beau ideal of a philosopher, at a time when his chief merits have been consigned by the most competent judges to the past. They were introduced to the

more spiritual philosophy of Germany, a philosophy whose general aim and tendency they will not soon forget, and from whose attractive influence few, who have given it serious attention, can entirely divest themselves. This has more or less entwined itself around all their thinking, and served very materially to establish their moral and intellectual habits. All honor to a Rauch and a Nevin, who led their students through the thorny mazes of German metaphysics, not merely with the view of exercising their intellects, as at a game of chess, but of confirming their religious faith, of planting in their minds sound principles of Ethics, and of awakening noble and generous emotions.

The same training begets a congeniality of taste and sentiment, and establishes many points of unity in minds that are otherwise differently constituted. To continue and increase this fellowship of mind and heart among those of the same literary and philosophical school, to cherish the sacred associations of the past, to turn these interesting relations into a source of mutual edification in the discussion of important principles, and to promote a literary and scientific taste, were some of the objects which were originally designed to be accomplished in the establishment of the Review; and it is believed that they can still be promoted, without interfering with a just attention to other objects, which the Review proposes to subserve. Few of the persons referred to will fail to appreciate considerations like these, and most of them have doubtless already experienced their practical force, as the Mercersburg Review has made its visits to them, and called them from the distractions of life to engage in serious thought over its pages.

The considerations already adduced, the interests of a religious denomination, and of what might be called an Anglo-German school of Philosophy and Theology, together with those of a more general character, that should always co-operate in the publication of a religious periodical, such as the cause of Theology, Literature and Science, of Religion and the Church, have combined to justify the continuance of the present enterprise. How far it is destined to meet the objects which it has in view, time must determine. Everything under present circumstances will depend on the industry and care with which appropriate matter shall be prepared for its pages by its friends. With no responsible head further than a Committee of Publication, it is now thrown into the hands of those who desire to see it pursue the even tenor of its way, and looks

to them for character, support, and the regular supply of interesting and suitable articles for publication. There is no reason why the ministers of the Reformed Church should be less active than those of other denominations in the preparation of valuable articles for the public press. Though the character of their respective fields of labor may give them less leisure for the study and investigation of theological subjects, yet they have this advantage, that denominational literature in their midst is thus far in its infancy. Much less has been said from their stand-point, and designed for their use, than in most other religious bodies of this country. The field, therefore, which the Review opens up for their intellectual activity is for the most part a new one, and the subjects upon which proper articles may be prepared for publication are almost endless. Its pages are thrown open for their use, and earnest articles from their pens written with taste, will be thankfully received and published. It is confidently believed that as soon as their attentions are turned seriously to the claims of the present enterprise, they will feel that it falls in with their proper calling, and deserves from them a generous zeal in carrying it forward.

It is of course also expected that the members of the Alumni Association will engage freely in preparing articles of interest and value for the columns of the Review. The duty of giving is based upon the fact that something has been received, and he who realizes that he has derived pleasure and edification from others, will feel himself prompted to make a return of the same character. If, therefore, the present enterprise should at all meet the objects which it contemplates, by becoming a stimulus to thought and reflection, it is hoped that the members of the Association may be found rivalling each other in contributing as well as receiving. The new auspices, under which their present publication now appears, increase very materially their responsibility in this respect. Will it in the end fail for any lack of zeal on their part? *Verbum sapienti sat.*

The principal cause of hesitation, however, in proceeding at once to meet the claims, which the public may have upon this publication, had reference to its ability to sustain itself in a pecuniary point of view. As ministers are expected to live by the Gospel, it is a plain case that a Theological Review ought to live by Theology; and that if no sufficient interest be taken in it to enable it to meet its just liabilities, it is not called for, and that they who have the charge of it will be exonerated

from further labor in keeping it up. The solution of this question was left mainly with the Publishing Committee, who were in possession of the necessary facts to arrive at a proper conclusion. They have seen no reason why the Review should be discontinued on this account, and have accordingly made arrangements to carry it forward under a form that will incur the least expense. Its financial condition at the present time is much better than could have been expected under the circumstances. Most journals of the kind are compelled in their incipient course to struggle with serious difficulties, in order to maintain themselves, as was the case with Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*, Blackwood's Magazine, and we believe the Princeton Review and others in this country. The *Mercersburg Review* has thus far, we may say, sustained itself, and if all its subscribers would do the Treasurer the favor to pay their subscriptions promptly, a handsome sum would be left in his hands to be devoted to the promotion of its best interests. When every thing is taken into consideration, it may be regarded as something remarkable, that a periodical of its peculiar character should have been able to sustain itself at all against the fearful odds that were against it. There is no publication in the country that has made less effort to court public opinion,—to spread its sails to catch the popular breeze. For the most part it has waged war against what has been considered established opinions, and venerated dogmas. It has not feared honestly and candidly to point out dangers, where they have been least expected, to hold up truth where it has been oppressed, and to make light of the many idols which the public has taken into its embrace. That it should on this account meet with angry rebuke in some directions, and that a friend now and then, who had walked with us, should turn away and walk with us no more, was nothing more than what might have been anticipated. The object of the Review, as was evident from most of its articles, was not so much to reflect the opinions of the greatest mass, and thus to agree with the greatest number, but boldly to advocate important principles, and then to let it rise or fall by its own issues. Theological Reviews are in most cases strictly denominational. They present views that meet with sympathy in particular sections of the Church, and hence they may reckon with safety on patronage, at least in the sphere in which they are more particularly designed to move. But it is a very different thing, when a periodical rises above denomi-

national limits, and aims at a true catholicity. In this country as yet the very idea is feared and dreaded. The general is for the most part made subservient to the particular, and in the religious world, where the process of disintegration has gone forward to such a fearful extent, the very idea of a "Holy Catholic Church" is lost sight of more and more. The man, therefore, or the association of men, who rise up against this general tendency, can expect little favor at the hands of the public; their books, or writings are placed under the ban of public opinion, which can control the press as despotically as any European Autocrat; and as it regards their persons, the most they can look for is a species of martyrdom, if they receive even that much attention. To the Publishing Committee the fortunes of the Review often became an object of intense interest, and at times we may say of amusement. When far out on the wave conflicting with wind and tide, some of its old friends seemed to be inclined to leave it as a sinking vessel, other new ones of a sudden appeared from another direction, and gave it a helping hand. Occasionally when a subscriber near at hand with "hot haste" sent in the request to have his copy discontinued at the close of the year, soon after a new subscriber was announced from Alabama, Maine, or even from Edinburg, Scotland. The fact, therefore, that now after an exposure of four years to fires of greater or less intensity, the Review has not been consumed, may well animate its friends with new courage and hope for the future. The righteous are never forsaken, nor their seed found begging bread.

The precise relation which the Review is to sustain to the future *Quarterly*, it is now difficult to determine, as that will depend very much on the tenor of the leading articles that may be sent in for publication. That there will be some modification in the new series, sufficient to justify the slight change which has been made in its name, will be evident from the change of editorial supervision that has taken place; and that there will be at the same time more or less sympathy between the two publications, may be taken for granted from the fact, that the one wishes to be in some sense the continuation of the other. It is not likely that the pages of the *Quarterly* will be very soon favored with articles of the same vigor and compass, as have emanated from the pen of the leading writer in the Review, except as that pen may continue its contributions under the new arrangement, as is hoped and desired. Few

persons will be found anywhere to write with the same earnestness and logical ability. No one can have read his articles in a very cursory manner without perceiving a degree of metaphysical skill seldom met with in this country. This is seen in the articles on "Cur Deus Homo," "Human Freedom," a "Plea for Philosophy," and others that might be mentioned. A metaphysical writer of ability in our region of the world is a *rara avis*, though nothing is more common than to witness in many writers a morbid ambition to appear metaphysical. The truth is, metaphysics is not every man's business, and the talent is as rare as that of poetry, or of any of the arts. In a practical country like ours it has few encouragements to call it forth: if it come at all, it must break through a storm of opposition, and manifest itself mainly in consequence of its own internal vigor; for strange to say, that in this case at least, the rarity of the article does not enhance its value, and that though there is a superfluity of practical talent of a high order among us, the cry is still for more and nothing else, whenever a serious, earnest, and calm theorizer stands up alone and attempts to give a safe direction to practical life.

It is also not likely that the Quarterly will be furnished with articles of the same ability on the general subject of the Church Question, though contributions may be made from time to time to fasten attention to its claims, and to keep up the interest already awakened in its behalf. It is a subject which few have had either the time or the ability to investigate so thoroughly in its manifold aspects as the writer in the Review. It was with him a matter of deep and thrilling interest, and this caused his pen to move freely, and encouraged thorough investigation. With the same general object in view he has produced during the last few years a series of original and learned articles, or rather treatises, all looking more or less to the solution of the same general question. The readers of the Review will still remember with what ability the Sacramentarian controversy of the Reformation was revived, and with what new interest and importance the history of that period became invested. Subsequently after having taken a glance at the middle ages, and made it appear that the Church had an existence during that dark period, and was performing in her own way the work of christianizing and civilizing Europe, attention was turned to the early ages of Christianity, first in the celebrated articles on "Early Christianity," and then in others on the church father "Cyprian," as the living, personal

representative of the Christianity of his time, and the exponent of much that went before and after him. Here the controversy, if controversy it may be called, for very little to the point has as yet been said on the other side, became invested with deep and fearful interest, and drew attention, we may say, from all sections of the Christian world, Protestant and Catholic, according as the discussion seemed to turn in favor of one or another religious interest at present existing. The immediate object of these discussions, however, has it is supposed in some degree been accomplished. They have served to direct attention to the importance of the general subject, and shown that it has a very wide and practical significance to Christians generally, from the humble sectary in our American wilds, up to the high-churchman, who thrives in the splendor of his admired hierarchy. The ground which they respectively occupy, together with that of all who are intermediate to them, is seriously affected by the solution of the question concerning the nature, character and attributes of the Church. At the same time, Christianity has been proved to be historical, not a transient phenomenon that appears from time to time, and in places best adapted to its growth, like a luxurious crop of vegetation. It is the product of ages, starting from a single point in the person of Christ, and then striking its roots down into the soil of human society, until it has become a tree beneath whose branches the whole world has sought for repose. This conception serves to invest the history of the Church with a living interest to the Christian. Next to the Bible, she presents an open volume, which he will find to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Any thing that is calculated to make the history of the Church important to Christians, and ministers especially, accomplishes a very desirable object, as at the present time the living, active present almost exclusively engrosses attention, and the earnest, serious, mellowed voice of truth, addressing us from the dim, distant shores of the past, is scarcely heard amidst the noise and commotion around us. Why the church-fathers should not become as familiar to ministers of the Gospel and Theological students, as the ancient classics, no sufficient reason can be assigned. What is proper in one case, is just as proper in the other, and indeed far more so. We presume there are few, who have risen from the reading of the articles on the Church Question in the Review, without feeling a desire to know more of the state of the Church in the past. If from

no other feeling but that of self-defence, he will most likely become far more wakeful in the study of ecclesiastical history; and facts, which he may have conned over in Mosheim, whilst he was half asleep, must sooner arrest attention and promote reflection. But no one reads history merely in order to sustain his own position, unless he has ceased to be wise. The proper form, which the Church of Christ is to assume, that she may appear decked and attired at his coming as his Bride, must necessarily become more and more a subject of earnest reflection with all true believers; and as the early Church throws a flood of light upon this point, its history must be studied with new zeal. To know what the Church is, or what she ought to be, she must be viewed in the light of her own history. If our thoughts extend no further than her present aspect and condition, we can never get beyond the mere surface of the question. We remain in the position of the Geologist, who attempts to explain the structure and history of the earth from a hasty glance at its external features. But the true Geologist does not proceed in this way. He descends into the earth, explores her primitive rocks, and from them deduces his theory. Thus it must be with the person who wishes to arrive at correct conceptions of the Church. He must dig among her primitive formations, and examine attentively the foundations upon which her present superstructure rests for support. If this be done honestly and diligently, who can object? What more force can objections to this have, than those which in the beginning were employed against the geologist? Geology advanced, correcting itself as it proceeded, until her results were turned into a science, entitled to respect and confidence. Thus it will be with all earnest theological investigations respecting the nature of the Church. The Review has performed a work of this character for the purpose of arriving at a true knowledge of its internal structure. It has contributed its part to the solution of the question proposed. A valuable accession, it is believed, has been made to the literature of the general subject, which they, who wish to pursue the subject further, will find it profitable to consult. Whether every position taken in the Review be regarded as tenable or not, its investigations will serve to invest the controversy with interest and importance, and supply abundant stimulus for further study and research. But though the Quarterly does not expect to compete with the Review in the vigorous, original, and peculiar style in which the Church-

Question has been discussed, it is not to be understood, that articles on that subject are not desired or expected to appear in its columns. The interest already awakened in its behalf will doubtless prompt others to resume the subject, and to present it under other aspects. The controversy with Rome, needs to be carried on more thoroughly and earnestly, and this must lead necessarily to discussions respecting the nature, attributes, and form of the Church itself. A periodical like the present cannot overlook a question of such importance, if it wishes to subserve the interests of the kingdom of Christ, or to be true to itself. It lies at the foundation of the Christianity of the present day, and needs earnest, prayerful attention from every one who desires that his religious hopes may rest upon something more substantial than the drifting sand. Let the discussion proceed within proper bounds, and though we may at times feel ourselves fearfully tost, and be required to yield up a favorite prejudice, or some cherished error, our spiritual interests will be promoted in the end. The present is the militant state of the Church, and no soldier of the cross expects a full respite from labor and care, until he enters the Church triumphant above. The winds, that toss the forest-oak from side to side, and deprive it of a branch or two, give it after all a proper symmetry of parts, and cause it to strike its roots deeper into the soil at the same time.

Whilst, therefore, the Quarterly must necessarily be somewhat modified by the auspices under which it makes its appearance, it is nevertheless believed, that the general tendency, with which the Review originally commenced, as indicated in its Prospectus, should be maintained and carried out as something sound and wholesome. It proposes to build on an old foundation, and asks for respect and confidence, only so far as it may have claims to be called a healthy historical development. It is desired by some that it should be more popular and practical in its character; by others, that articles of a more purely literary character appear in it from time to time. These would doubtless be desirable improvements, and efforts shall be made to promote them. Let those, however, who wish to see them brought about, manifest proper diligence with their pens, and the object will be accomplished. But the general spirit of the Quarterly ought to be one and the same, showing itself more or less in all its articles; this we have said ought to be the same as that of its predecessor. In order, therefore, to show the *animus*, with which it is thought it ought to be pervaded, it

may be proper to refer to the leading ideas with which the old Review commenced as announced from time to time in its various Prospectuses. These are religious, as they should be, because the character of a book, as of an individual, must always be determined by its relation to religion. Scientific or philosophical discussions have no true value, except in their bearings upon our eternal destiny; these bearings, though remote and indirect, should always point to God, the source of all Truth.

In the first place, the motto remains the same. According to this, faith must precede knowledge, and not the reverse, as the Rationalist would have it. This sentiment, borrowed from Anselm, is the universal voice of the Church respecting the relation of faith to knowledge. Augustine had long before affirmed the same thing. *Fides præcedit intellectum*. He himself learned it from the more sure word of prophecy. If any man will do the will of the Father, says Christ, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. John 7: 17. And in another place he tells us what it is to do the will of God: This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent. John 6: 29. In our days it is doubtful whether this truth is felt as properly as it should be, or as honestly embraced. The circumstances and relations, in which we live and move, all combine to reverse the rule, that is, to place knowledge before faith. As ours is an age of light and knowledge, nothing escapes the severest critical investigation. Knowledge is everywhere regarded as power, and supposed to be the grand lever by which the world is to be elevated in a civil, social, and spiritual point of view. Most of the improvements of the times spring from the dissemination of knowledge, and the application of known scientific truths. The useful arts are all indebted to science for their proud achievements. Agriculture is promoted by the application of simple principles elaborated in the room of the chemist; the arts of war and navigation are reduced to fixed principles, and reach their highest perfection when these are the most vigorously applied. The same may be said of railroads, telegraphs, and other useful conveniences of the age. They either derived their origin from scientific men, or their operations are simplified and brought to perfection by their discoveries and investigations. Under these circumstances the danger and the temptation, to make knowledge occupy a similarly prominent place in the sphere of religion, are plainly manifest, and we

accordingly find that the holy mysteries of revelation are subjected to a profane criticism, and received or rejected as they may appear to suit the mere subjective understanding. This tendency has broken out in wide-spread Rationalism of various grades and descriptions, which proceeds with more or less boldness, until everything mysterious, or above reason in revelation, is rejected, or frittered away in cold speculation.

The rule, however, which seems to work well in nature, works disastrously in the world of grace. It is by our natural understandings that we arrive at a knowledge of nature, and its various phenomena; but this is not the case with reference to the spiritual world; this is revealed to us only by faith. The kingdom of heaven has been, and it will continue to be a mystery to man in his natural state. No amount of human learning or knowledge can enable him to reach it, or comprehend it; no cultivation of the heart or the understanding can bring him to see it, or to love it. Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble are called. The philosopher here stands on a level with his illiterate neighbor, and is equally as helpless in his own resources in arriving at the knowledge of this mystery. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are *spiritually discerned*. 1 Cor. 2: 14. Faith is everywhere in scripture made the first and fundamental requisite for the attainment of true wisdom. It is the first act in which men are called to engage, when they earnestly seek their elevation above nature and sin. Believe and thou shalt be saved, is the message repeated from age to age, that must serve as the infallible guide to the regeneration and renovation of the world. But salvation, which is the result of faith, includes knowledge, and every other spiritual endowment. Faith introduces the soul into union with Christ, by virtue of which it is regenerated, that is, made the bearer of a new life, from whose mysterious depths the new man is to arise in the beauty and symmetry of a new creation. Life every where precedes the organs or parts of the body, to which it gives rise; it is the most fundamental of all our activities, and underlies them throughout in their manifold operations. Thus religion, as a divine life in the soul, must lie back of all our religious activities, whether in the understanding or the affections, and lead to their proper growth and expansion. Wisdom and knowledge, as its fruit, must come afterward, or with it in its onward development.

From this point of view the Quarterly, like its predecessor, can have no sympathy with those whose general tendency is, to reduce religion to a cold, intellectual system, divested as far as possible of all mystery. It regards Rationalism as one of its natural enemies, which it has obligated itself to oppose at all times and in all circumstances, as an intellectual virus, that is stealthily penetrating the Church and corrupting its life. Turning from the caricatures, which this spirit has made of the gospel, it would exclaim with Paul, *Great is the mystery of godliness*, without being ignorant of the fact, that in an opposite direction lies another extreme, which we do well to fear also. The gospel has always been a mystery, and to deprive it of that character now, is to deprive it of its chief glory, its depth, its length, its breadth; rationalism appears to elevate man, but at the same time certainly renders very shallow the fountain of all truth. The very term revelation has reference to the gospel under this character, for it is only the successive unfolding of that which was concealed before. Whilst it was hid from the heathen world for thousands of years, it was committed to a single nation, the Jews, and made known to them only through dim types and shadows. The advent of Christ into our world did not change its character in this respect; it is still a mystery, incomprehensible to the world, and seen by the holiest of men only through a glass darkly. It is a treasure, which its Author keeps concealed from the gaze of the profane, for they would be blinded by its ineffable light, and like swine would try to destroy it; whilst he reveals it to faith in proportion as it is enabled to endure its divine glory. It is a pearl of great price, hidden in the "dark unfathomed caves of ocean," to be obtained only by such as seek for it. No gem or diamond was ever confined by iron bands so firmly, as the divine mystery is from men living in the element of nature. To suppose that the truths of revelation may be measured by the finite reason of man, is as irreverent as the practical manifestations of the unbelieving spirit in the world generally. Humbling as this truth is, and desirable as it might seem, that we should be permitted to take the loftiest flights in the spiritual world whilst we are confined to time, it is but right and proper, that under our present circumstances, some limits should be set to the excursions of the intellect—that it should be under the necessity of obeying the command, *Thus far shalt thou go, and no further*. The Maker has a right to require implicit faith in his word, especially where the truth is of such a

character as to be incapable of being brought down to finite comprehension. Human pride, which concentrates itself in the intellect, must be subdued before it is ready as a docile child to sit and learn from the divine truths. Mysteries so far from being injurious are essential to the very existence of religion. Apart from their necessity in a supernatural revelation, they have not only an humbling influence; they serve to arrest attention and promote reflection; they give the imagination ample room to throw around eternal truths the bright colors of the heavenly Paradise; they awaken admiration, awe, reverence,—a glow of spiritual feelings, that have no place in the worship of the cold rationalist, but which are an essential part of all true religion or worship.

But faith is by no means opposed or inimical to knowledge. It is only the right relation of the one to the other that is to be insisted upon as a vital point, whilst proper regard is paid to both as necessary factors in the Christian life. Faith introduces life and health into the mind, and prepares its faculties for vigorous activity; it restrains its wayward flights, and brings it back to God, the source of all truth, knowledge, science; it lays the solid foundations, upon which every intellectual structure must rest, to be firm, or permanently useful. Christianity has always been friendly to knowledge, and as far as it has advanced, it has continued to spread light. It turns knowledge to practical account, employs it for the highest and best of purposes, and thus gives it the character of true wisdom. If it must be obedient to faith, the subjection is not an arbitrary one, for faith seeks to be guided by the Divine Eye, and not its own; if the world cannot comprehend this knowledge, it is its own fault, for this knowledge is wisdom only to the "perfect." In thy light we shall see light. Psalm 30: 9. Knowledge under such restraints is a blessing to the world; in its pathway it spreads a benignant light, and is the only safe director to man, tost from wave to wave of doubt, without compass or helm, and without object or aim. For the spread of truth under this form, the *Quarterly* unites with the *Review* in cordial co-operation, and by its side would raise its voice for the right, until all knowledge, arts and sciences, are made contributory to the kingdom of heaven, and are brought cheerfully to engage in the service of the Church.

The *Quarterly* aims further, according to its Prospectus, to be honestly and sincerely Protestant. By assuming this position, however, it does not endorse every thing that calls itself

Protestant, or every form of Protestantism, that may appear from time to time. Its sympathies are much more with the Protestantism of the Reformation-period, or what may be regarded as its proper historical development, than with much of what has come to be regarded as an improvement on the original work. The Protestant Church, as is known, is now unfortunately divided into a variety of interests, many of which are but remotely related to each other, and are bound together only by slender ties of sympathy. As a whole it has its *conservative* as well as *radical* tendency, and the Quarterly has no hesitation to choose the former as the safest position to occupy, whilst it would contribute its part to check the extravagances and extremes into which the latter is constantly running. That there is such a thing as ultra-protestantism, just as there is an ultra-montanism in the Church of Rome, there ought to be no manner of doubt. In the nature of things, it is something that might be expected in so large and active a body as Protestantism, though this necessity does not divest it of its dangerous character. Here, as well as elsewhere, the centrifugal force is ever active, and in danger of running out into a tangent, instead of describing its own proper orbit, and it requires all the power of the opposite force, to restrain and prevent a return to chaos.

This radicalism shows itself in various ways. For fear of superstition, it rejects all mystery in the Christian faith, and runs blindly into as absurd an extreme in the other direction. The pendulum has swung over into the region of rationalism, that haughtily rejects whatever is above reason. We find as an evidence of this, that the very word, mystery, with its derivatives, excites fear and alarm in the minds of many pious people, and with some they are identical with priestcraft, imposture, and the lowest superstition. How inimical to revelation such a feeling may become is plainly manifest. Let a generation, or a community, once learn to hate or despise mysteries right heartily, and who does not see that there is but a step between them and open infidelity, a step which their more adventurous children will most likely take? No matter how much imposition has been practised under the name of mystery, it is a word that occurs frequently in Scripture, and to set it aside in any way, will only serve to set aside that to which it refers. Liberty and the gospel themselves are sometimes abused in the same manner.

Private judgment came in with the Reformation, and it has

always been regarded as something essential to the proper life of Protestantism. It is indeed its honor, as to it we are indebted for the extension of the area of human freedom. But what is the strength of Protestantism may become its weakness, and what is its honor may be turned into its disgrace. This has already been exemplified in the rise and spread of sectism, to which a wrong view of private judgment has given the impulse. Sectism has become a virulent plague in the Protestant world. It has split the Church of Christ into various ecclesiastical bodies, representing so many shades of religious opinion, that it seems difficult to divine what new principle, or part of a principle, the next religious reformer shall make use of in raising up for himself a party. It has allied itself with radicalism, and entered into most of our ideas of reform, where it sets at defiance the laws of human progress, and runs out into a rabid revolutionary spirit, that can destroy, but not build up. The progress of society, it is supposed according to this spirit, ought not to proceed gradually, by preparing itself for each higher epoch, towards which it tends, but should be raised up by a sudden and violent rupture, whether it be prepared for the change or not. Thus it is a common opinion with many that republican institutions should be transplanted to European countries, in order to relieve the groaning masses, without any regard to the circumstances, or the previous history of the nations, who are to be thus highly favored. The liberty-cries of Europe receive for the most part a respectful hearing in this country, and excite throughout our land a flood of sympathy. Christians here participate largely in this feeling, and the cause of European liberty accordingly becomes identified with our Evangelical Churches. It is supposed by many persons that the interests of religion may be promoted by thus swelling the tide of opposition to the time honored institutions of the old world. But let us remember what this method of warfare implies, and in what position it places our Churches. It evidently presents the incongruous spectacle of Christians in America co-operating with the radicals of Europe in disturbing governments, in promoting disorder, confusion and revolutions. Some time ago this palpable inconsistency came strikingly into view in the case of a distinguished clergyman, who, believing that he ought to "unite with *all* the great movements of the age," advocated Kossuthism and war against Austria, after having been a long and tried friend of the Peace Society. Recent events, and the revolu-

tions of '48, have served, it is true, to dissipate very materially our views of the propriety of transplanting our institutions to European soil; it is seen that the period for such a regeneration is now apparently more remote than ever, since what promised so much in the beginning, has only resulted in an accumulation of evil. But wrong views of the progress of society still remain. These are radical in their nature; they have no regard for the past, and as they are selfish, and look for no support in history, they can never rectify themselves. Persons who entertain such views of progress, have no conception that it is something like leaven, which proceeds silently and unseen until the whole frame-work of society is penetrated by its quickening influences. They have no sufficient reliance upon the word of God, that liveth and abideth forever, or the living powers, that go forth from his Church to regenerate and save the world; and as they thrust out of view history as an essential element of social progress, they disregard the command, Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Because of the sympathy, which many Protestants give to the spirit of modern radicalism in the forms already mentioned, as well as in others, the enemies of the Protestant faith have come to identify it with these extravagances. It is asserted and maintained with much assurance, that Protestantism and radicalism are identical in spirit, that the one leads necessarily to the other, whilst both tend in their ultimate consequence to infidelity; that Protestantism is an essentially negative and self-destroying interest, which, instead of containing any principle of life, involves in it only the principle of dissolution; that the Reformation, instead of being what its name denotes, has only served to disorganize society and the Church—to set into operation a system of disintegration, which is now beginning to work out its results, and which will continue to do so until nothing is left for it to operate upon. This is the picture, which our opponents draw of us, and it is truly one that we can take no delight in looking at. How then can we feel comfortable, when the reality, in some respects, at least, is spread out before us every day in the false forms of Protestantism? No one who has any veneration for the faith, in which he was born, can look with composure at caricatures of that faith thrown upon him by an unfriendly hand; how can he then look with less composure at the living, actual caricatures, that meet him every day? If his feelings be sound and

always been regarded as something essential to the proper life of Protestantism. It is indeed its honor, as to it we are indebted for the extension of the area of human freedom. But what is the strength of Protestantism may become its weakness, and what is its honor may be turned into its disgrace. This has already been exemplified in the rise and spread of sectism, to which a wrong view of private judgment has given the impulse. Sectism has become a virulent plague in the Protestant world. It has split the Church of Christ into various ecclesiastical bodies, representing so many shades of religious opinion, that it seems difficult to divine what new principle, or part of a principle, the next religious reformer shall make use of in raising up for himself a party. It has allied itself with radicalism, and entered into most of our ideas of reform, where it sets at defiance the laws of human progress, and runs out into a rabid revolutionary spirit, that can destroy, but not build up. The progress of society, it is supposed according to this spirit, ought not to proceed gradually, by preparing itself for each higher epoch, towards which it tends, but should be raised up by a sudden and violent rupture, whether it be prepared for the change or not. Thus it is a common opinion with many that republican institutions should be transplanted to European countries, in order to relieve the groaning masses, without any regard to the circumstances, or the previous history of the nations, who are to be thus highly favored. The liberty-cries of Europe receive for the most part a respectful hearing in this country, and excite throughout our land a flood of sympathy. Christians here participate largely in this feeling, and the cause of European liberty accordingly becomes identified with our Evangelical Churches. It is supposed by many persons that the interests of religion may be promoted by thus swelling the tide of opposition to the time honored institutions of the old world. But let us remember what this method of warfare implies, and in what position it places our Churches. It evidently presents the incongruous spectacle of Christians in America co-operating with the radicals of Europe in disturbing governments, in promoting disorder, confusion and revolutions. Some time ago this palpable inconsistency came strikingly into view in the case of a distinguished clergyman, who, believing that he ought to "unite with *all* the great movements of the age," advocated Kossuthism and war against Austria, after having been a long and tried friend of the Peace Society. Recent events, and the revolu-

tions of '48, have served, it is true, to dissipate very materially our views of the propriety of transplanting our institutions to European soil; it is seen that the period for such a regeneration is now apparently more remote than ever, since what promised so much in the beginning, has only resulted in an accumulation of evil. But wrong views of the progress of society still remain. These are radical in their nature; they have no regard for the past, and as they are selfish, and look for no support in history, they can never rectify themselves. Persons who entertain such views of progress, have no conception that it is something like leaven, which proceeds silently and unseen until the whole frame-work of society is penetrated by its quickening influences. They have no sufficient reliance upon the word of God, that liveth and abideth forever, or the living powers, that go forth from his Church to regenerate and save the world; and as they thrust out of view history as an essential element of social progress, they disregard the command, Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Because of the sympathy, which many Protestants give to the spirit of modern radicalism in the forms already mentioned, as well as in others, the enemies of the Protestant faith have come to identify it with these extravagances. It is asserted and maintained with much assurance, that Protestantism and radicalism are identical in spirit, that the one leads necessarily to the other, whilst both tend in their ultimate consequence to infidelity; that Protestantism is an essentially negative and self-destroying interest, which, instead of containing any principle of life, involves in it only the principle of dissolution; that the Reformation, instead of being what its name denotes, has only served to disorganize society and the Church—to set into operation a system of disintegration, which is now beginning to work out its results, and which will continue to do so until nothing is left for it to operate upon. This is the picture, which our opponents draw of us, and it is truly one that we can take no delight in looking at. How then can we feel comfortable, when the reality, in some respects, at least, is spread out before us every day in the false forms of Protestantism? No one who has any veneration for the faith, in which he was born, can look with composure at caricatures of that faith thrown upon him by an unfriendly hand; how can he then look with less composure at the living, actual caricatures, that meet him every day? If his feelings be sound and

healthy, he must feel himself constrained to rise up in opposition to those who take shelter under his Protestant name, but conceals under that name a foreign spirit. Infidels are known to laud Luther to the skies for encouraging free discussion, whilst they have no respect for any positive tenet which he promulgated.

But Protestantism, when properly understood, is not radicalism, and its friends have a historic right to deny the imputation. A history of three hundred years has proved, that it can promote in the highest degree the interests of society and man; and that instead of being a virus, it has been the salt of society. The Reformers were themselves far from being radicals. They all fought against the radical tendencies around them, and were the first to throw back the charges preferred against them of sympathising with them. Luther frowned upon the Anabaptist movement, and destroyed it with the breath of his mouth. Calvin wrote his Institutes with the object of convincing the king of France and the world, that Protestants were not to be classed with the wild spirits that had at that time broken loose from their confinement. The gentle Melancthon, whose spirit is beginning to rule more and more in the Protestant world, was, of all of them, the farthest removed from this pestilential atmosphere. The historian Balmes errs, when he asserts that the Reformation was the mere explosion of the inflammatory material which had accumulated for ages in Europe. There was at that period doubtless any amount of such kind of material at hand, and ready at any moment for a general conflagration. Providence, however, ordered that the volcanic eruption should not take place, and employed the Reformation to do what the old Church, after many earnest efforts, could not do. It was the antidote, that kept Europe from the deluge of radicalism and infidelity, which were beginning to manifest themselves in various directions. It rose up and gave a positive and religious direction to the public mind, when faith had declined, and men had become desperate enough to engage in any enterprize. We believe that pure Protestantism is attended with similar results at the present day, and that its friends, so soon as they discover the direction into which our modern ultraism would lead it, will turn back aghast. It has a recuperative force, derived from the divine life which it embodies, that will save it from the evil tendencies springing up in its midst. Its character, as progressive Christianity in opposition to one that is stationary and fixed, gives

it a peculiar facility not only in passing beyond particular dangers from without, but its own weakness also, the sin that doth so easily beset us.

There is room then, we may say, for the advocacy of a conservative Protestantism, in opposition to that which is radical, ultra, unhistorical, untraditional, and disobedient to father and mother. We believe it shall eventually inherit the land, and that its days shall be long therein, which shall be its reward for its filial reverence and obedience, whilst that which is opposed to it shall lose the inheritance. It is somewhat remarkable that various particular cases of recent radicalism were denounced from the Mercersburg standpoint before their character had become known, and whilst they were still in their glory. This was true of the Ronge movement in Germany and this country, the World's Convention, the Kossuth intoxication, and the anti-Catholic phrensy, lead on by the monk of La Trappe, and favored by many bearing more honorable names. Time will show whether the predictions uttered from the same position, concerning a certain Italian priest in England, were not also well founded, and whether it was wise on the part of many good Protestants to stake the credit of their cause and faith on his veracity. A position, which can expose movements of this description, and do it too from settled principles, ready at hand, ought to be regarded as entitled to some respect. The Quarterly considers it as the safest in this age of shallow notions and profound impositions.

The Quarterly, finally, whilst it seeks to be Protestant, has no hesitation in seeking to be truly Catholic at the same time. This results naturally from the character of the Protestantism which it professes. If it turn away with horror from the abuses of private judgment, if it fear rationalism and radicalism, it looks for support in true catholicity, and finds in it the most effective weapons of defence. The antidote for all kinds of radicalism is to be found in the study of history and reverence for the past. In religion it is love for the Holy Catholic Church and her history. He who lives in an organism so vast and comprehensive as the Church, overtowering him by its lofty domes, and leaving him a mere pigmy in its wide halls, is not likely to remain the prey of his own subjective fancies, or the slave of a party. He breathes the pure atmosphere of that which is general, and feels his individuality not destroyed, but purified and elevated by it. It does, we believe, the cause of Protestantism a gross injury, to say that it possesses nothing of

a Catholic nature in its constitution. The word still remains in most of her symbols, and is often uttered without constraint in her devotions. Her most earnest prayers and aspirations look for her emancipation from the shackles of sect and party.

An extreme in this direction is doubtless to be avoided. We do not wish to confound Catholicity with Roman Catholicism. So far as this latter can be shown to be truly Catholic, all should sincerely rejoice; the interests of truth as well as of piety conspire to render it a consummation most devoutly to be wished for, that it may be made to appear from good reasons that its character is higher and better than is generally supposed in this country and England. But the objection against the system as a whole, that, notwithstanding its huge organization, it lacks in Catholicity, and therefore cannot cover the whole ground occupied by the catholic Church of Christ, is still of force. It has taken up into its life many elements of human nature, and a great variety of religious tendencies, often of an apparently opposite character, and brought them into the service of religion; but it rejected Protestant Christianity, and could find no room within its wide pale for the free, intellectual, and vigorous nations, derived from a German origin. It rejected the stone which the Builder designed for the corner-stone, whilst it gathered from the highways material of a less valuable or permanent character. To this day it has not seen or acknowledged its error. It still fights against the nations, which it once had under its tutelage, and tries to detract from their claims upon the respect and confidence of the world. In its more ultra adherents it would annihilate the fair inheritance which they have gained for Christ and his Church. With a stroke of the pen certain writers in this country and Europe would blot out every blessing which Protestantism has conferred upon men. Its faith, its learning, its literature, its institutions, have no value, and they might be dispensed with as readily as heathenism, with which it has been compared.

A system or church that cannot lengthen its cords or strengthen its stakes, and cover so noble a race of men as are found in the Protestant world, cannot claim for itself a true catholicity, without a limitation. It must have within it diseases, errors and corruptions, that prevent it from expanding to the full measure of a Holy Catholic Church. Hence it has never become more than Roman Catholic. The doctrines and tenets which it holds in opposition to the Protestant body have

not yet become general, and it is difficult to see how they can be made to appear to be of this character, until the other side of the Christian Church comes to endorse them as such.

The Quarterly with the Review looks, hopes, and prays for a higher position than the Church has yet reached, when there shall confessedly be one shepherd and one fold, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism; and bases its confidence in the memorable prayer of Christ, that his people may be one, as he and the Father are one. What is impossible with man, and impracticable in the ordinary course of human affairs, is possible with God, and practicable in his Church, where Christ lives and the Holy Ghost is shed abroad.

T. A.

ART. II.—PAROCHIAL, OR CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

"Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4.*

THESE words furnish the foundation, and the leading thoughts, required in the present Article. We are here taught that children are to be "brought up" religiously—that this is to be done by the combined use of two kinds of means, nurture and admonition, or discipline—that this duty rests upon their parents—and that it is to be done in the Lord.

These are precisely the ideas that lie at the foundation of that system of religious training known under the name of Parochial Schools. In those countries where the State recognizes only one denomination of Christians, a certain district is assigned to a congregation as its limits; this district is called a *Parish*; and the school, under the direction and supervision of that congregation, for the instruction of all the children in that Parish, is called a Parochial School. We retain this name. With us it means a school in a congregation, and under its oversight, for the instruction of all the children in the families of that congregation; and all such others as may desire to embrace the advantages there afforded. It requires that the Bible be read and explained; that the Catechism be used as a form of doctrine; that prayer and singing be heard and taught, and that a religious life be cultivated in the hearts of the children in connection with the development of their minds.

* The above article is the substance of a sermon delivered by appointment at the meeting of the Synod of the German Reformed Church, in October last, in the city of Baltimore. It is now published by request of that body.

It demands that the teacher be pious, and that he labor with, and under the direction of the Pastor; and that to instruction, be added a wise and Christian administration of discipline. In this way the school becomes a Church School, it secures to the children a training in the Lord—a training which includes the two elements of nurture and admonition.

The word *nurture* has a sense of its own, which we will do well to fix definitely in our minds. It is not to be taken as synonymous with the general terms, training, instructing, teaching or educating. Its meaning lies beneath these; in other words, these are the fruits or effects of nurture. The word nurture designates that which the mother is to the infant—the medium source of its life—the cause of its growth toward perfection. The word educate, and its kindred terms, designates a mere *drawing out* of what is already at hand. Education is a training and trimming of branches, nurture is a feeding of the roots. The word education is not used in the Scripture, evidently because the Scriptural view of our nature does not allow the idea that we can become what we ought to be by a mere drawing out, or educating, of what is in us.

Nurture *precedes* in order, education or training. As the germ of the vine is nourished in the bosom of the earth and nurtured out of it, before it can have the training hand applied to it, so the life of nurture is moulding the infant being before it is sufficiently aware of an outward world to be affected by its reasons and its regulations, in such a way as is involved in the idea of education. Hence nurture includes those more hidden, and more delicate appliances which exert so great an influence on the infant being, without its own will, knowledge, or co-operation. Nurture is to the child what the warmth, the moisture and the fat of the earth are to the roots of the infant plant—what the light and love of the mother's eyes, the warmth and nourishment of the mother's bosom are to the unconscious babe which is there—and is there gladly, but knows not, and cares not why.

According to the true sense of nurture, children are to be nourished *in* the Lord, not educated *into* Him. As plants are nurtured in the ground and from it, so children are to be nurtured in the Lord and from him.

Does the Scripture allow us to regard our children as in the Lord? If we are Christians—yes. The covenant and promise bestowed upon parents included their seed. If one of the parents is a believer then are the children holy, says the apostle. By baptism they are planted together in the likeness

of the Saviour's death, that in that position they may rise in the likeness of His resurrection. Those who are baptised into Christ have put on Christ. Those who are baptized are represented as in the same position as Noah was in the ark—saved, if they go not out of it. Those in covenant are saved if they break not out of it. To be nurtured in covenant is to be nurtured in Him. Hence we find that the Scriptures always speak of those that are covenanted in Baptism as His people, as in a gracious position and state, as children and heirs. They are always addressed as such: You are my people, forsake me not—you have a God, seek not other gods—you have promises and hopes, cast them not away.

Children in the Church are represented as planted in the house of the Lord, where they are to "grow in grace," being nurtured into the full stature of men in Christ, by the resources which the Church furnishes. In short the nurture of the Church is to be to the spiritual part of the child, in all its wants, what the nurture of the mother is to the infant in a physical point of view.

Nurture implies the evolution of the *whole being in a uniform way*. Education may refer to the development of some one part of the being, in some one department of knowledge; but nurture is that deeper leaven, which leavens the whole, or that deeper life of the mustard seed, which causes all its roots, its branches, its leaves, blossoms and fruit, to appear in their season, and in their place, not in monstrous distortion, but in beautiful proportion and symmetry.

It can be shown, from the history of Education, that the idea of education in the form of nurture was never understood except by the Church; and that it can never be carried out, but by the Church. As it is impossible, however, in the short space of time allowed for this discourse to treat the subject historically, we must attempt to illustrate the point in a shorter way: By reviewing different systems of Education without any reference to the time of their existence. We shall see that no system ever yet reached the idea involved in nurture in the Christian sense of that term. It will be seen that all these systems were partial, one-sided, fragmentary—a mere outward daubing or patching,—a mere trimming of branches, and generally the trimming of one branch to the entire neglect of all the rest. They make their man as did the ancient Egyptian sculptors, among whom making heads, arms, legs, bodies was each a separate business, separately carried on, by separate

persons—the man was afterwards joined together out of all these separate parts. There was no nurture needed there. In like manner the Christian idea of nurture can have no place in a system of education which proposes to make the real man by a similar aggregation of parts, made to order in separate places, and by different hands.

I. Let us glance at what we will call the Pagan System.

All pagan systems may be characterized in general, as making the spiritual, and the eternal, subordinate to the bodily or the earthly—or, as was often the case, leaving that side entirely out of view. The body must be trained for war, the soul for the state. What they taught of the gods, of immortality, and the future life, was, for the most part, because it was believed that these ideas furnished useful checks upon the minds of citizens, and contributed towards making them better citizens. Eloquence was studied to move the populace to attachment to the State: poetry and history to recount the heroic traditions of their ancestors, to inspire love of country. All centered in the State. Shooting the bow, launching the javelin, and all kinds of athletic exercises, calculated to make the physical system expert for war, stood prominent in their views of education. All was adapted to make them hard and heroic.

No training which would exert a softening or refining influence was allowed. The Egyptians, for instance, regarded Music as a useless, dangerous and mean diversion. Philip, the Macedonian, said to his son Alexander, who sung with skill at a feast: "Are you not ashamed to sing so well." The Romans treated music with contempt. The Greeks, among whom it received most favor, found at last that it combined, with dancing and the stage, to ruin the State.

"In Carthage" says Rollin, "the study and knowledge of youth were for the most part confined to writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, and the buying and selling of goods; in a word, to whatever related to traffic." They were trained to do business, and make money. The Persians, Cretans, and Lacedæmonians did not entrust the education of children to their parents; even the divine order of the family was broken in upon, that the State might train them for its own ends. Their aim was, "To form the soldier and the citizen." Parental responsibility as well as filial duty were in effect abrogated. Lycurgus, "regarded children as belonging more properly to the State than to their parents, and wished that patriotism should be still more carefully cherished in their breasts than

filial affection." His great maxim was: "Children belong to the State, their education ought to be directed by the State, and the views and interests of the State ought in it alone to be considered." In this system of education the children were detached from the families to which they belonged, and gathered together in public establishments, where they were entirely under the care of teachers appointed by the State.

Here there is a conflict between the family and the State. Instead of being citizens of the State *in* the family, they are made citizens of the State *out* of the family. The family is in the State, but is at the same time ignored, and its educating influences declared dangerous. According to the divine order the State is not constituted of individuals *out* of families, but of individuals *in* families—as the family produces individuals for the State, so it is also to educate them for citizenship. In religion filial love and patriotism are not in conflict with each other, but in harmony. The best child will make the best citizen.

We see that in all these pagan ideas, man's immortal nature is left out of view, or at least made subordinate. Earth excludes heaven. Time excludes eternity. The body ignores the soul. The State abolishes both the Church and the family, instead of forming with them, as is done in the divine order, the great *triad*, in which all the help, hope, and harmony of earth are bound up.

In this system man is educated in part, but not nurtured as a whole.

II. The idea of nurture is not reached in another system of education which I will call the *infidel system*.

While the system to which we have alluded, under the previous head, proposes to educate the natural man for natural ends, this proposes to cultivate the natural man, as a natural man, for ends higher and better than nature. The system to which we allude proposes merely to cultivate nature by following nature. It leaves the doctrine of human depravity entirely out of view. It regards human nature as needing, not renovation, but simply reformation; it supposes it to be good in its roots, and that it needs education only to draw it out and make it better. It is not the nurture of a new life of grace in the soul, starting from Christ in baptism, but it is the education of nature starting in nature. That which is to be educated is not the being which is born of water and the Spirit, but it is that which is born of the flesh and which is flesh; and which, when

educated, will be flesh and nature still, which however refined, cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

This system, had, if not as its father, yet as its master expounder, the celebrated Rousseau. He sets out with the proposition: "Our business in bringing up children should be, to second and to call forth nature." We must be careful, according to this system, in no way to forestal or mislead nature. All we dare do is very gently to stimulate nature to develop itself. We must nurture nature, and train up the child, not in the way we think it should go, but in the way it will go. Listen again to the oracle on education: "With great care prevent the child from forming any habits whatever. Prepare him for the enjoyment of liberty, by preserving to him the exercise of his natural abilities, unfettered by any artificial habits." Suppose we should treat the trees in our nurseries thus! "Sacrifice not the present happiness of your child for the sake of any distant advantage." That is, subject him to no discipline; nature must be free! "Be not over-anxious to guard him against natural evil. Seek not to impress him with ideas of duty or obligation." That would be to restrain, or at least to tax his liberty. He must grow up free like a weed; ; all you have to do is to work nourishment into the soil. A luxuriant monster it would make!

Hear again: "From the hour of his birth till twelve years of age the education of Emulus must be purely negative. Could we bring him up healthy and robust, and entirely ignorant till that age, the eyes of his understanding would then be open to any lesson: free from the influence of habit and prejudice, his passions would not then oppose us; and we might render him the wisest and most virtuous of men. If we can but lose time, if we can but advance without receiving any impressions whatever, our gains are unspeakable."*

All this, in the form in which it is presented by Rousseau, seems not only profane, but nonsensical and ridiculous; but look closely, and you will find that this very system, in substance,

* "Perhaps, in the midst of society, it may be difficult to bring up our pupil without giving him some idea of the relations between man and man, and of the morality of human actions. Let that, however, be deferred as long as possible."

There are various means to be used to keep the child's mind free from the idea that one thing is right and another wrong. One is this: "If the child sees one angry, we should tell him that he was affected with a fit of sudden illness. This will prevent the unhappy effects of the example."

"The first moral notions that should be communicated to the child are those of property."

has been baptized into the Christian name, and reigns under Christian patronage. What else is the educational system of Unitarians, but an attempt at educating nature into grace. In their system, grace is not a basis to educate from laid in baptism, but grace is something to be attained to by education—the beginning is nature, the end reached is grace. A plant without a soil. Education is a leading forth of nature; if not of nature, then of nothing; for according to their view baptism does not lay a basis of grace in the infant heart. May we not say, in refutation of this idea, that which is educated of the flesh, is flesh.

Could Rousseau's idea of keeping the child negative up to twelve years, be realized, what could better suit the Baptist's system? He believes in no grace given in Baptism which warrants the parent in believing that his child may, from that point on, be nurtured in a real divine life, so that no technical experience, or sudden violent transition, is afterward needed to constitute him a Christian. He does not believe that God has made such provision in His system of grace, that a child may be inserted in grace, and may be brought up in the Lord's nurture. He does not believe that the child has gracious life, how can he nurture it? The beginning of that life which is to be nurtured, only begins in the conscious faith of the adult. What then is he educating or nurturing in his child, if he educates anything? What but nature? for nothing else is there, according to his own confession! If there is nothing there to educate, and he educates nothing, then it is his policy to see that the child is kept negative. He cannot train the good in him—he cannot train grace for there is no basis of grace there. He dare not with the Unitarian, train nature, for he believes that to be depraved! and that would only make the case worse! What can he do that is consistent, but adopt the very language of the master of the infidel system, "With great care prevent the child from forming any habits whatever—seek not to teach him ideas of duty or obligation, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin—teach him not to pray, for he has not yet exercised faith, and is therefore unregenerate, and the prayers of such are abomination to God—bring him up healthy and robust and entirely ignorant—his mind must be kept purely negative; for all the progress he makes, is but an evolution of his depraved nature, and an increase of his sinfulness!" Such, without caricature, is this infidel system when set to work under Christian patronage. They begin to

feel it in New England where the system reigns in bleak blue glory. "Our very theory of religion," exclaims one troubled, and a troubler among them *—"Our very theory of religion is, that men are to grow up in evil, and be dragged into the Church of God by conquest. The world is to lie in halves, and the kingdom of God is to stretch itself side by side with the kingdom of darkness, making sallies into it, and taking captive those who are sufficiently hardened and bronzed in guiltiness to be converted." Thus there is no hope for children but their growing up in sin—their habits are formed in unregeneracy—those very years, during which their susceptibilities are tenderest, and when formative influences could most easily do their work, are hopelessly sold to nature and Satan; and in adulthood, when the tide of life, as it has all along flowed, is most determinate in its own direction, the spirit is to be jerked, by a kind of holy violence, into a regenerate state!

Thus the Church lives not by nurture, but by excitements; for in this way only, it is supposed, can adult sinners be reached and conquered. Children in the Church, grown up without Christian or gracious nurture, in adult age, present the appearance of a neglected field overgrown with those weeds, and briars, and thorns which spring up naturally from the earth, which when the summer is past is nigh unto cursing—it is a wilderness of combustible matter, which can only be cleansed by a conflagration—and when the fire has passed over it, how desolate!

Speaking of this system in contrast with the system of true nurture, the same author, just quoted, confesses thus: "We have worked a vein till it is run out. The churches are exhausted. There is little to attract them, when they look upon the renewal of scenes through which many of them have passed. They look about them with a sigh, to ask if possibly there is no better way, and some are ready to find that better way in a change of their religion. Nothing different from this ought to have been expected. No nation can long thrive by a spirit of conquest; no more can a church. There must be an internal growth, that is made by holy industry, in the common walks of life and duty."

This system is mere education, not nurture. In so far as it even seems to be nurture it is nurture *in* nature, and *of* nature, instead of nurture in the Lord. Besides, it excludes entirely one side of education: it admits of no "*admonition*"—restraint

* Dr. Bushnell on Christian Nurture.

or discipline. It insists that nature must be free, all we dare do is to "second" and "call it forth." This system then, however much it may, in some of its details, be favored among some professedly Christian sects, is not a Christian system, and does not reach the true idea of Christian nurture.

III. There is a system of education in which intellectual and religious training are *severed*, and treated as interests that may be separately carried forward. Wherever this idea prevails the true idea of Christian nurture is excluded; for nurture proposes to develop the growth of the entire being in a uniform way—one part of his nature cannot be left to stand still while the other is going on. The intellectual and religious are not different natures, but only different branches of the same nature, and they must be nurtured together in the unity of one life.

The system which we are here reviewing errs in two extremes. When it is attempted to cultivate the religious at the expense of the intellectual; or, when it is attempted to cultivate the intellectual at the expense of the religious.

First, religious culture which overlooks and leaves behind the intellectual. This has in some ages, and in some lands, been the error of the Roman Church. That communion has not, and does not now, value in due proportion the intellectual culture of the masses. In that Church, as we believe, the priestly and kingly offices have too much crowded out of view the prophetic office. We think this will appear as truth from an impartial observation of the cultus of that Church. It may be seen in all their services that the prophetic office stands but faintly in view. In what they do teach there is not full justice done to man's intellect. What they teach is rather something to be believed, than something to be known. That intellect should bow to faith is, of course, all right; but intellect should not be ignored by faith. The Roman Church we believe does not full justice to the intellectual side of its members. In this way it does,—though perhaps not intentionally—give some appearance of reason for charging them with holding the motto that, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion." For some reason or other, there is not, in that communion, a zeal for the intellectual elevation of the masses, such as we believe the best interests of their religious life demand.

In the Greek, and other oriental Churches, this want of attention to the intellectual side of man prevails in a worse, and a wider form. What the masses there are taught, is for the most part a mere by-rote knowledge, and lies in the mind

only as a habit, and as a cold, formal, husky tradition. Their priests are generally themselves ignorant of all except the tread-mill services of which they live, and through which they pass in the most lifeless monotony. Children are taught to say over religious formula, like Mahommedans say over the Koran, without knowing or caring whether it contains any reason or any sense.

The same evil, and the same error of which we are treating, is also found among some of the modern sects. There is however this difference, that while those ancient organizations ignore intellect by faith, these ignore it by feeling. With them feeling is the most prominent part of religion. Knowledge is regarded as dangerous—or at least as being a matter only and merely for this world, and as being of no account in reference to the next world. All wisdom is regarded as the wisdom of this world, just as if there were not also a feeling of this world, as well as a wisdom of this world. This is a partial view of man's nature. It proceeds upon the false principle that the intellectual and religious sides of our nature are in conflict with each other, and that the whole man can be nurtured and perfected by leaving one side of his nature wholly out of sight.

Secondly: There is another extreme into which this error runs; it is when there is an attempt to cultivate the intellectual at the expense of the religious, or independently of the religious. This error proposes to keep the two interests separate. It is admitted that children should have religious culture, but then that is a matter to be separately attended to. The intellectual is to be attended to, and the religious is to be added to it in due time. The school is regarded as having only to do with the intellectual, leaving the religious for the family, the Church, and Christian charity. The child is to take to school nothing but its mind; and is there to be nurtured as a mere intellectual being. This is the error which reigns most extensively on the Protestant side of the Church and has its systematic exhibition in our common public school system.

On this system we must offer some strictures, for it stands more directly, and more formidably than all the others, in the way of Parochial or Christian Schools. In offering what we shall offer on this point, we are not ignorant that many of the best men, with the best of motives, have been, and still are, the zealous friends of this system; neither insensible of the pain, which the conclusions at which we shall arrive, shall cause that class of philanthropists, should they carry the same force

to their minds as they do our own. Nor would we claim the honor of making any discoveries in this department, but desire only to give intelligent or definite expression to what we are sure is fast becoming a general feeling.*

The Common School System makes no provision whatever for the religious wants of children. Religious culture there is studiously excluded and prohibited. The child may have any views, or no views, in religion. It is to be taught nothing in that direction. No book giving religious instruction "shall be used as a school book, nor admitted into school." The Bible is barely tolerated—it may be read, but, "without comment by the teacher." No religious qualifications are sought in the teacher. In short, mind, and mind only, is to come in play, and to be dealt with in the culture of common schools. The system aims only at educating part of man. It aims only at preparing him for the State and for business, not for the Church. It takes in only time and earth, not eternity and heaven.

In this system education is taken out of the hands of the family, and of the Church. Those who have charge of the educational interests, are not the pastor, church officers, and pious school-masters, but "Directors"—a kind of committee for the time, who attend to the duty in the same spirit as they would to laying out a road. The school-house no more stands on the green beside the church—where all religious associations congregate—where the spirit of religion lies, like sweet sunlight on every object around, and where the graves are!—but they are stuck, like milestones, wherever a cold mechanical system assigns them their place. It may happen just as well as not, that the associations of childhood may be bound to the top of a bleak hill; in the region of some miserable marsh with its ponds and mud; or near some gloomy old still-house with its styes and its stench! Parents, whose highest concern it is to have their children's minds expanded in a religious element, are compelled to send them to a place where no pious whisper is allowed, where religious instruction is contraband and unlawful, and where the teacher may be an infidel. Where the director may be any one at all—one whose highest ideas of education are reading, writing and cyphering—one who perhaps cannot read at all. What parent can comfortably submit his children to such a system of miserable orphanage!

* It is proper to premise, that the strictures we make are intended to apply directly only to the Common School System in Pennsylvania, and to the system of State schools in other States, only so far as they are similar to this.

The system of Directorship, as established by law in these schools, however well it may look in theory and in law, does not answer the purpose in practice. All the directors generally do, is to procure a teacher and firewood, and one is generally procured in the same spirit as the other, with least trouble, and at the lowest price. After the school begins directorship in effect ceases—the teacher and the school are then left to direct themselves. The consequence is disorder, which gets ever worse. Already there are many parents who decline sending their children to the common schools, on account of the profanity, vulgarity, and rudeness which are found to reign there.*

It is but a comparatively short time (1835) since the common school system has been established in various parts of our State; yet there is already that in its history which condemns it. Almost every year the school law has been altered and amended. Defects were discovered in its workings, and the Legislature was called upon to remedy them. The history of the School Law in Pennsylvania, reminds one of an attempt to patch the rents of a rotten garment—the contraction required to mend one makes two worse ones. This altered, amended, renewed School Law is sent out with its tables, its charts and supplements, as a guide to Directors to whom it is as unintelligible as the statement of an algebraic equation to a child that just begins to spell. It was the confession of a lawyer, of twenty-five years' practice, to me, that he had evidently given up the idea of ever understanding the Common School Law. The very fact of its constant changings and amendments, shows that it is a system without system—that it is a dabbling in experiments without sure principles to regulate or define. To such a ship of sails without rudder, floating at random, we are to entrust the educational interests of our country. Every successive and ever-changing Legislature is to be permitted to subject the system to its own caprices, and, if they choose, to launch out into new experiments. Think of it! to a system of education which ignores religion in its teachings, a system in the hands of a new Legislature every year—with yearly a new superintendent, new laws, new directors, and generally a new teacher—to such a system we are to entrust the nurture of our children. Who can comfortably build his house on such a foundation of rolling pebbles and floating sand!

* Children learn from example *before* they can understand the grounds and reasons of moral obligation; hence the injury which they receive from the bad examples which are constantly before them in common schools.

We can also show, from the confessions of its warmest friends, that the system is radically defective. The fact they see, but seem not to see the reason of the defect. In 1812 Philadelphia was authorized to establish public schools for the poor. It was soon seen that there was something defective in the business. A committee was appointed in 1816 to inquire into the weak points of the system. They report that many do not attend at all during the year, though \$22,000 were spent to educate them. But this is not the worst; such was the character of these schools that, "Such as were absent suffered less by their inattention than many of those whose morals have been thus undesignedly injured at the county expense." Not the worst yet: "In every view, therefore, of the existing plan of public education, with which your committee are furnished, they are reluctantly and sorrowfully compelled to declare, that from its first establishment to the present time, it has, in their opinion, been not only injurious to the character of the rising generation, but a benevolent fraud upon the public bounty." The patrons of this system forgot that educated mind without religion is educated vice; and that mind can only be stimulated to seek its improvement by something higher, deeper, and more earnest than itself. Now they are reminded of it by the failure of the experiment.

This testimony to the inadequacy of the system which we are reviewing is so much the stronger from the fact that the Christian system is praised in contrast with it by the same committee. I start in quoting farther from the same report at the very next sentence where I left off: "It is a consolation, however, to reflect, that during the last eight years, in the course of which almost \$200,000 have been spent upon a scheme of public instruction so uselessly, there have been in successful operation numerous schools for the free education of indigent children, superintended from the most praiseworthy motives by respectable citizens; and that in these institutions many pupils of charity have had their minds imbued with sound morals, and been otherwise fitted for the proper discharge of their various duties in future life. But for this reflection, the prospect would indeed be gloomy; for in these benevolent labors, it is hoped, a redeeming principle has been established, the happy effect whereof may yet be manifested."

These extracts need no comments. We see in them the difference between education without religion, and education with religion.

The present Common School System in Pennsylvania has only existed some eighteen years. Already it is deeply felt to be wanting. It does not answer the purpose. We will not speak of the general mutterings of dissatisfaction which are heard especially among the Christian community; but we will quote from the confessions of its very foster parents, to show that it bears the elements of degeneracy in its own bosom—that it cannot sustain sufficient interest in itself to carry out its own regulations, and to reach forward towards the securement of its own ends.

I will quote from the Report of January, 1850, by Thomas H. Burrows, the most zealous friend of the Common School System in Pennsylvania: "Whoever shall closely examine the annual reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools, will find, that very soon after the establishment of the system, say about the year 1839, a certain degree of progress had been effected towards its perfection; but that, since that period, little if any improvement has taken place in its most essential particulars. School-houses have, it is true, been erected by thousands, and teachers in the same proportion have been employed; hundreds of thousands of pupils have been brought into the schools, and the gross expenditure of the system has risen to ten millions of dollars; but when he comes to the true test of its efficacy and utility—the *pay of teachers*, and the *duration of teaching* in each year—he finds a sad falling off. In the years 1838, 1839, 1840, teachers seem to have been better paid, and consequently their services better appreciated, than at any time since; and in 1837 and 1838, the duration of teaching was one-fifth greater than in 1847, '48, and greater than in any year between those two eras, or since. These indications are unerring. They point to one or other of two inevitable results—either that a system which thus fails in accomplishing its great object, viz: that of giving sufficient instruction, by means of capable, and, therefore, well paid teachers, must go down; or that it must be so strengthened as to effect its noble purposes."

Again, he says: "But among the evils of the system . . . is the want of an efficient head—a sufficient driving power in the system." That it lacks this, he says, is evident from the falling off just mentioned. "This manifest want of vigor, the committee believe, exists in the head, not in the body of the system."

Here we have the true, and what is worse, the incurable

weakness of the system exhibited. It degenerates—is less efficient by far in 1847 than it was in 1837. It started, like all false systems, with a spasm, and gradually died down to a tame level. The plant shoots up with extraordinary facility, just because it has no real depth of earth, and then pines away for the same reason. It lacks motive power, it lacks vigor, it lacks a head. Thus it lacks all; for what is that worth which has no head, no vigor, and no driving power. All these, which a state system that regards nothing in man but mind, must ever lack, are supplied in a system which connects the School with the Church. Where the Church underlies the School, imparting her nurture to the whole being, regarding him in his eternal as well as temporal interests, there will be head and motive power in abundance. The vigor of her infinite earnestness will be infused into all her educational operations. Then the School Law will be the law of life and grace in Christ Jesus, and not merely the pamphlet laws of an ever-changing legislative body, to be administered by an ever-changing committee of directors. The teacher will be no hireling for a few months, but a functionary of the Church, whose piety insures his faithfulness—a teacher who is not merely asked by a committee, Do you know science? but one whom the Saviour himself asked over and over, “Lovest thou me?” before he gave him the awful solemn and responsible commission: “Feed my lambs!”

Whoever will read the annual reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools with care, will feel convinced that the evils which are the burden of ceaseless complaint are essentially in the system, and cannot be cured. We hear without end of the “sluggishness of Directors and parents;” and of “the carelessness and unfitness of teachers.” In the report of 1849 we read: “The practical effects of the plan are truly deplorable. Scarcely a mail arrives that is not loaded with complaints of the inability of the teacher, of his immoral habits, and of the bad condition of the schools. Petitions to the Superintendent, for redress of grievances over which he has no control, are frequently presented; and expressions of dissatisfaction are not rare against the continuance of the system.” Report of 1849.

This indifference and opposition are not to be ascribed to a want of interest in education, but to a want of interest in schools without a soul or a God. There is an instinctive sense of the false principle upon which the system rests; and its

practical exhibitions daily increase that suspicion. Hear the Report of 1850: "Complaints are heard from various quarters that the system has failed to accomplish the purposes for which it was designed, and that the funds of the State are wasted. These expressions of dissatisfaction must not be ascribed entirely to ignorance and prejudice; they come, in too many instances, from honest, intelligent citizens, true friends of Education." Even the zealous advocates of the system betray that they know where the difficulty lies. They feel that the "motive power," which they say the system lacks, could be furnished by religion. "Ministers of the Gospel," says the report of 1848, "could exert an influence, which might reach every fireside, *opening the eyes of the blind, and unstopping the ears of the deaf*, on the subject of rational and moral education." So they might, and so they would, were not they, *in the capacity of ministers*, virtually shut out from the schools. If parents are sluggish in sending their children, how can they be moved to duty except by the higher "driving power" of religion; but this is contraband in the system. Shall ministers be expected to manifest zeal for the education of immortal beings for this world merely? The Common School System can never, in its present form, gain the confidence of the Church and ministry; even if the system did not itself virtually exclude their influence, the false principles which it involves are too radical, and in their practical workings too disastrous, to receive either favor or toleration. The time is not yet, and it never will be, when those, who alone have received the commission, "Go ye, and teach all nations," will surrender their responsibilities into hands which they know are not adequate to the task. They must first forget their own accountability, and lose all respect for the will of Him, whose they are, and whom they serve.

It is all idle. The interests of education cannot be long sustained and vigorously carried forward, unless religion underlies the movement as its motive power. It is well known that colleges do not flourish except under the auspices of the Church. It is Christianity, and that alone, which wakes man to industry and earnestness in every sphere, and consequently also in reference to the cultivation of mind. It is the feeling of immortality that is the impulsive power toward all ambition in expanding the intellectual faculties. It is sin that darkens the mind, and its removal must accompany all attempts to brighten and expand the intellect. All history declares that

religion is the mother of science—that faith is the mother of knowledge.

In the establishment of our Common School System there was professedly at least an aim at imitating the Public School System of Prussia. In 1836 Professor C. E. Stowe, who was about to make a tour through Europe, was requested by a resolution of the Legislature of Ohio, to collect facts in reference to Public Schools. In 1837 he made a long report, in which he dwells principally on the Prussian system, and recommends it in the highest terms; this report was published by order of the Legislature of Ohio. In 1838, the same report was ordered to be published by the Legislature of Pennsylvania. In the same year a large pamphlet of seventy-eight pages was published in Philadelphia, "On the System of Education adopted in the celebrated Common Schools of Prussia." All this was intended to effect a conformation of our system to that of Prussia. But how great is the deception! Almost the only thing in which our schools and those of Prussia are alike, is that they are both public, state schools. Farther than this there is no resemblance at all. How do they differ? In their system religious instruction is included by law; in ours it is excluded by law. In their schools religious instruction is the first thing; here it is not at all. There the religious element pervades every thing connected with the school; here it is contraband in every thing. That is religion as the mother of education; this education without religion. That is nurture in the Lord; this is nurture without the Lord.

"The first vocation of every school," says the law of 1819, (the system went into operation in that year) "is, to train up the young in such a manner as to implant in their minds a knowledge of the relation of man to God, and at the same time to excite in them both the will and the strength to govern their lives after the spirit and precepts of Christianity. Schools must early train children to piety, and therefore must strive to *second and complete the early instruction of parents*. In every school, therefore, the occupations of the day shall begin and end with a short prayer and some pious reflections, which the master must contrive to render so varied and impressive, that a moral exercise shall never degenerate into an affair of habit. All the solemnities of the school shall be interspersed with songs of a religious character." In another section of the law it is enjoined that the Bible and the Catechism shall be used. The New Testament shall be read by the smaller children in the

common language; and by the youths in the gymnasias, in Greek. It is also provided that, "In all the parishes of the kingdom, without exception, the clergyman of every christian communion shall seize every occasion, whether at church, or during their visits to school, or in their sermons at the opening of classes, of reminding the school of their high and holy mission, and the people of their duty towards the school." *

Now contrast with this, our own Public School System. "No catechism, creed, confession, or manual of faith shall be used as a school book nor be admitted into the school." "The Old and New Testament may be used in reading, but without comment by the teacher," 1838. The difference between the Prussian system and our own is that of direct opposites; and yet we are told that "the province of education in the two countries are nearly the same, except that the Prussian system aims at higher objects than the common education of this country." Only this difference! as if this were a matter of no importance! The "higher objects" may be set aside. So think these sages of the State, in the face of all history—in the face of the wisdom of the wisest men that ever lived—and in the face of the holy instincts of all pious parents. "The fear of the Lord, is the beginning of wisdom."

One who, in a publication in 1838, exhibits the Prussian system by way of lesson and example to the friends of the Com-

* It is argued, by those who are in favor of excluding the Bible from the schools, that children become profanely familiar with it, that they are apt to lose all reverence for it, and that it creates in after life a feeling of distaste and even disgust for it. Never was any idea more false. The direct reverse is true. Are not those things that were most common and familiar to us in our childhood the dearest and most cherished by us now? When we, after years, return to the dear scenes which our infancy knew, how strong and affecting are those feelings awakened in our bosoms by the smallest and most trifling things. Every tree, every stump, and every stone, preaches to us silently till we stand and weep. A similar feeling is bound up with our associations in reference to those passages so often read from the Bible, in our school-boy days. Many of us know it by experience; and the Scriptures, when we read them now, have a new glow of warmth and power of attraction, because they connect our present life, deep in our memories, with childhood's happy, happy days. Reading the Bible in school make it tasteless and profanely familiar!—as well might we argue the same of the love of a mother. No, there is a light in which all things are sacred; it is in the light of those impressions which memory receives in childhood. In the language of one who knew better to preach than to practice,

"Long, long be my heart with such memories fill'd!—
Like a vase, in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may ruin the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang round it still."

mon School System in this country, makes a remarkable confession. After expatiating on the excellencies of the Prussian system, he says: "But if these schools only taught letters and science, if they formed no moral principles and habits; if they took no cognizance of the laws of duty—none of the defenceless state of a mind uninformed of the evil that is in the world—if they never turned the attention of the young to the Providence of God, and his divine attributes; if they never connected the present life to the eternal; if they afforded no expositions of morality; if they presented it only in negations; if they referred it exclusively to the Sunday, the minister, the Church, and the casual Sunday-school, and the self-culture of ripe age—to what mere worldliness and technicality, to what selfishness and implied materialism, to what small effects and low purposes, would they be employed, and how much would they leave undone, which their broad policy, and tried efforts actually accomplish?" Every word of it is true. And every word a just judgment and condemnation of our ten-times helpless, wretched, and ruinous Common School System.

To show how perfectly inadequate our system must be, we need only remark, that even this Prussian system, so thoroughly religious, is pronounced a failure, by Samuel Laing, Esq., an English traveller of much weight, on account of its subserviency to the State. Says this learned traveller in 1842: "If the ultimate object of all education and knowledge be to raise man to the feeling of his own moral worth, to a sense of his responsibility to his Creator and to his conscience for every act, to the dignity of a reflecting, self-guiding, virtuous, religious member of society, then the Prussian educational system is a failure. It is only a training from childhood in the conventional discipline and submission of mind which the State exacts from its subjects. It is not a training or education which has raised, but which has lowered, the human character. This system of interference and intrusion into the inmost domestic relations of the people, this educational drill of every family by State means and machinery, supersedes parental tuition. It is a fact not to be denied that the Prussian population is at this day, when the fruits of this educational system may be appreciated in the generation of the adults, in a remarkably demoralized condition in those branches of moral conduct which cannot be taught in schools, and are not taught by the parents, because parental tuition is broken in upon by governmental interference in Prussia, its efficacy and weight annulled, and the

natural dependence of the child upon the words and wisdom of the parent—the delicate threads by which the infant's mind, as its body, draws nutriment from its parent—is ruptured." Page 172. Laing's Notes.

If a system so decidedly religious fails, just because it is a creature of the State, what can we hope for in ours! We believe, however, that Mr. Laing attributes the failure, so far as it is one, to the wrong source. The Church and religion have sufficient prominence in the system to insure complete religious culture; in so far as the system falls short of answering its end, the failure is to be sought in the fact that ever since the system was organized until lately, the Church has been so petrified by the reign of rationalism, as to disable it entirely from infusing a truly regenerating influence into the School System. The school had an inactive Christianity to underlie it—its religious teachings were merely theoretical. But we repeat—if the Christian system of schools in Prussia is scarcely to be saved from condemnation, where must our poor bald, negative system appear!

When the education of children is left in the hands of the State alone, as is done in the Common School System, it is mere means to an end—and what is worse, mere earthly means to a mere earthly end. But Christian nurture is not merely means to an end—it is means and end in one; and, what is better, heavenly means to an heavenly end.

When religion is excluded from education, what end has education in view? The world in its various interests—an end lower, instead of higher, than the means themselves! When religion is connected with nurture as it is in Parochial Schools, it is viewed as means to an end higher than itself, but the means at the same time as part of the end. This Christian nurture will appear as part of the process of a life constantly progressing from lower to higher—the lower ever terminating in the higher, and becoming complete in it.

That education which is carried on separate from religion offers a constant invitation to the child to look downward to a lower earthly end. For the child will reason, and if not reason, it will feel, thus: If the end of education is not earthly interests, if its end be higher religious interests, why are not those higher interests held forth prominently as the goal of the educational process! Why are the means made to look shy at the end? And why this jealous care to keep the means sep-

arate from the end? If education is to make us better, as well as wiser, why is that better proscribed and kept out of view as though it were ruin to come in contact with it? If education is to lead to the Church, why is the Church ignored and thrust out of sight, and why are we the pensioners of the State? If we are to be servants of religion, as the highest aim of life, why is not religion our master and teacher? If we are now, and are still to be, the children of the Church, why does the Church permit us to be treated as bastards, and turn us over without a sigh, as orphans, to this tax-supported almshouse of the State! If the Church is our mother, why does not she nurture us; and if it is not the design that we shall forget our mother, and be weaned from her, why are we so carefully kept, by legal prohibitions, from hearing her name, from feeling her tenderness, and from sharing in the genial warmth of her love?

Such are the practical contradictions of the system. We do not mean that the child will draw such conclusions, and see these contradictions, intelligently; but the position in which it stands, and the element in which it moves, will lead to this result practically and in fact, with the force of ceaseless, silent, but inevitable necessity. Birds of passage know not why they move as they do; but they are nevertheless under the power of forces which affect their instincts, and which they have no power to resist or control. So in the case before us. Indeed, just as instinct in animals is often a surer guide than reason in man, so the ingenuous and confiding spirit of childhood, will be more easily moulded and led by the silent influences in the midst of which it moves, than by light and logic.

It is the seemingly distant and careless attitude in which the Common School System stands to the Church in the education of children, which is so powerful in weaning their hearts from her. It is not positive opposition, but negative indifference, which is the root of the evil. It is in this, as in other cases, distance, coldness and carelessness, more than all else, that alienates the heart from what it ought to love, and would love, but for that. A child weaned in early infancy, removed from its mother, brought up among strangers, not permitted to hear her name pronounced, except with the uplifted finger of caution, and hearing that it is almost a crime to praise her virtues—such a child can never afterwards have all, if any, of the feelings which belong to the relation of a child to its mother. It is just so when we permit our children to be trained out of the Church, where her name is not heard except in a way which

implies that she needs to be watched, and that her influence is especially to be deprecated in the nurture of man's intellectual nature. Thus the Church is, in fact, a man of hideous face, looking out upon children from the dark, filling their young spirits with secret dread, and causing them to go as far as possible the other way for fear of hidden evil; and, just as those superstitious fears which are wakened in the confiding heart of childhood by thoughtless parents or injudicious nurses, can be removed by neither reason nor philosophy; so the feeling of fear and jealousy toward religion which this false system of education inspires, will present its repulsive images before the spirit, in spite of its better judgment, to the latest hour of life! He that—or any system that—instills in the heart of a child any fear but the fear of God, or raises any doubt or dread but for that which is evil, has made wrong what he never can make right! The sting of a fly, in the infant oak, may, a thousand years afterwards, be the blemish in a plank in the bottom of a ship, which sinks men and treasures! Wo unto him who breaks but a link in the chain of things!

It furnishes no sufficient apology for the system to say that the evil is only negative—that although the instructions of Common Schools impart nothing positively religious, neither do they impart any thing irreligious—that they leave the spirit as to religion and morals a *tabula rasa*. This is equally its misery. Indeed it is this plausible angel-of-light-pretense that constitutes the very heart of the danger of this false system. We are not merely to teach them no evil, but we are to bring them up in the Lord's nurture. Negatives are as destructive as positives in this respect. Doing no evil constitutes no saint. Not gathering is scattering abroad. Give a plant no nourishment, no sun, no heat, no moisture, and it will die just as effectually as if you put a worm at its root. Give a child no food, no drink, no air, and its death is as certain as if you give it poison: besides, it dies more cruelly; so, give the spirit no nurture and it dies. The spirit of the child is no dead *tabula rasa*, which you may leave unimpressed at your pleasure, but it is a *tabula viva*, which cries in the agony of hunger, Give me food or I die! Let it be considered by the way, that it is this *tabula rasa* philosophy that lies at the root of every false system of education. Rising like a upas in the field of mind, it has cast its killing shadow over ages, and has ever been the tutelary god of an infidel culture. Its tendency has been to hush the infinite in the human spirit. It has done much to

ignore that side of man's nature which fastens him on God and the unseen. It has, to a great extent, fastened him to earth, and compelled him to crawl empirically like a blind spider, feeling his way either by cautious or impetuous experiments. It has taught him to fill his mind with items of knowledge as he finds it, as a boy fills his basket with berries, instead of growing in knowledge, by evolving his nature under the power of the divine out of the infinite in and around him. It has undervalued man's dependence upon the broader life of the general. It has turned the Church into a conventicle or society, and human beings into individuals. It has made education a mere gathering for the mind, instead of a gathering *in* and *by* the mind—or an evolution of the mind by nurture. It has cried *tabula rasa* until the human treats itself as such; and the Church, forgetting the deep reason of the Saviour's infancy and growth in body and in mind, forgets also the importance of infancy in general as related to the Church and its nurturing cultus.

In estimating the full extent of those evil results which flow from a system of education, from which all positive religious influences are excluded, we must consider that those formative influences which are visible and tangible, are but a small part of those which actually mould the child's intellectual and moral life. There is an education of *circumstances*—or shall I say an education of *atmosphere*. An education, not so much of the marked influences exhibited in formal instruction, as of the element in which the young life moves and has its being during the time that its education progresses. Our physical growth and health depend generally not so much upon preventive or curative medicines given at intervals, as upon the constant lavings of those silent influences of air, temperature, and other elements which are friendly to vitality and health. So, the mental and moral health of children depend chiefly upon the silent and intangible force of circumstances, example, society, and what may be called, in general, the atmosphere in which they live, breathe and grow. As, in our physical system, every sense,—hearing, seeing, tasting, touching, smelling—is, more or less, though silently, the avenue of health or disease, so are these same senses in their relation to the mind and heart. In this view we discover the true depth of meaning in such passages as, "He that walketh with wise men, shall be wise," and: "Evil communications corrupt good manners." We, by a deep necessity, become like that which surrounds us. We—as the Poet has it—

"We become pure by being purely looked upon."

As flowers are colored in the light of the sun—though silently!—so are the minds and hearts of our children by the educational air in which their faculties are evolved.

These silent educational influences of which we speak, and which affect every period of our human life, are most momentous in early life. Because, then the plasticity of the spirit more easily yields to formative forces from without; and the direction, which is then given to the evolution of the soul, has a longer history before it, either for evil or for good.

A pebble in the streamlet scant,
Has turned the course of many a river;
A dew-drop on the infant plant,
Has warped the giant oak forever!

We see in the case of a plant, that those formative influences which have most to do in shaping it for life, are least open to our inspection: They lie and work behind the tangible, and they do their work before the plant is sufficiently advanced to receive any help from without in the way of training. Its germ grows yellow and languid before we can suspect the cause, in the worm or the ungenial chemical, which has invaded its life at the root. In like manner, the failings and fadings in children which often dawn, like a mournful prophecy, upon the attention of anxious parents, have their roots farther back than their eyes can trace, and are lost to view in those delicate attenuations which form the fibres of the infant life. In seeking, therefore for the causes of ill or good in our children, we look not to the things which are seen, but to those which are not seen; for in this sense, too, the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. In this view, the poets paradox reveals one of the deepest of truths:

"The child is father to the man;"

and in this sense the Saviour's axiom may also be applied: "There is nothing hid that shall not be revealed;" we add the converse, by way of legitimate inference: There is nothing revealed that is not first hid.

Is it not clear, then, that immense interests are involved in the early training of our children; not merely in the instruction imparted to them in a formal way, but in the educating influences of position and circumstances. Is it not clear also that

true Christian *nurture* must underlie all education or training, doing its work before these can properly begin, and animating, pervading, and sanctifying them as their secret life and soul? * Is it not plain also that the Common School System can never afford such educational accommodations as the solemn duties of Christian parents make it necessary to demand for their children? They, if they at all understand their responsibilities to their children, can only be satisfied with church, or parochial schools.

It may be said, Is it it not our duty to provide educational facilities for those that are out of the Church? And how can means be provided for the education of all, if it is not done by the State? State schools cannot be made religious schools, because Church and State are not united; and, on account of the various views of sects, it would be impossible to introduce religious instruction.

We acknowledge the difficulties in all this; but the difficulties of making things right should never reconcile us to that which is wrong. In regard to sects, the difficulty shows only that sects are wrong, and not that a school system without religion is right.

In regard to the duty of educating all, we answer, that it is yet to be shown that the Common School System will accomplish this. The reports complain abundantly that many parents do not send their children. This will ever be so; it rests upon the deep principle that religion alone can foster the education of mind; and that educational interests are *only* sustained where religion underlies them. Where this is not the case, the "driving power" is wanting; and any educational system that has not religion for its soul, cannot enlist sufficient interest in itself to sustain itself in existence. As in the child a sense of dependence, of trust, confidence and faith precedes all developments of intellect; so, in all systems of education faith must precede knowledge and sustain it. A system, therefore, which neglects to foster faith, cuts itself loose from the source which alone can sustain it.

But again. Could even all be educated intellectually as the system proposes, is education without religion a blessing? Is knowledge, the wisdom of this world, as such, praised in the

* What system of Moral Education is like to avail in opposition to the contagion of example and the influence of notions insensibly, yet constantly instilled? It is to little purpose to take a boy every morning into a closet, and there teach him moral and religious truth for an hour, if, so soon as the hour is expired, he is left for the remainder of the day in circumstances in which these truths are not recommended by any living examples.—*Dymond's Essays*, Page 254.

Scripture? Verily no. Unless the life of grace underlies and sanctifies all intellectual activities, their cultivation is but a strengthening of the natural powers of evil. As already said, educated nature is educated vice. Had Paine, Volney, Voltaire, and others, been ignorant men, the world had been more blest. It is the same on a smaller scale. The smallest mischief, that fulfils his sphere of evil in the most obscure country circle, is the worse for his smartness, and is a curse to his neighborhood in proportion to his wit. Unsanctified knowledge, like unsanctified wealth, is so much influence on the side of evil. Knowledge is power—power for evil, or power for good, according to the wish and will of him who holds it. Knowledge in faith is a power *for* God; knowledge without faith is a power *against* God. When we say, therefore, that it is our duty to educate all, that declaration must be modified and limited thus: *It is our duty to educate all religiously.* It is not our duty to meet the world on its own ground. We are not to “teach all nations” as *they* please, but as our commission directs: “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Saviour has commanded them.” We dare not misread our commission, meet the world on its own terms, and teach them only what will fit them for worldly interests, and worldly ends, engaging that that which Christ has taught them shall be studiously kept out of sight. Such a mode of educating the world has never received the promise, which is appended to the true commission, “And lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” Hence we take our stand on the true parochial or church system, and urge all, just as we do sinners to repent and believe, to meet us on the true ground, and to receive at the hands of the Church a true education—an education complete, of heart as well as of mind—for eternity as well as for time—for the Church as well as for the State—for the perfection of themselves as men, and not only as citizens. If they reject this offer, we have performed our duty, and theirs is the peril.

It must be remembered that another duty *precedes* the duty of educating all: It is the duty of educating properly and religiously our own children, and the children that are in the covenant and Church of God. These are placed nearest to us in the order of God, and must be first attended to. As we have opportunity we must do good to all men, but *especially* to the household of faith. When favors were claimed for the daughter of a Canaanitish woman, the Saviour said, “Let the

children first be fed." We find, hence, that in the Acts of the Apostles, salvation was always offered first of all to the Jews, as the covenant people. So here: our duty to educate all, is subordinate to our duty to educate our own, as families, and as a Church. To manifest zeal for general education, to the detriment of particular education, is to outstep the divine order. He must not go abroad in search of duty who has not finished at home. The Church has no such responsibility to educate all, as requires her either to neglect her own, or to permit them to be educated under a wrong system.

Should even the alternative be to educate the young in general, without religion, in the Common School System, or not educate them at all—which we by no means grant—then it would be the duty of the Church, in the spirit of sacrifice, to submit to the tax required, and at the same time, by voluntary liberality, to sustain her own religious schools besides. This many are in fact now doing, whose conscience, and interest in the religious education of their children, forbids their exposing them to the negative, if not irreligious, atmosphere of common schools. The rich can do this, and do do it; many poor would do it if they could. The same principle is here involved, which comes forward so abundantly in history, where Christians by voluntary gifts have sustained their own religious privileges in the bosom of a national Church, while they continued, as good citizens, to pay their tithes to the established religion besides. As long as we regard education separate from religion as a matter of interest to the State, and only negatively evil, we can sustain the Common School System as a system of national education, without a violation of conscience or sacrifice of principle, while we nevertheless decline using it for our own children. If this negative education has any tendency to make better citizens,—if its results are good only so far as the body, the State, and this life are concerned, it may even be a Christian virtue to submit to the tax demanded. We will cheerfully yield to the children of this world the right of having what is *good*; but for our own children—for the children of the Church, whom we wish to bear in the bosom of our faith, and in the holy nurture of the Church, with us into a higher life,—we ask that which is *better*: and, so far as we can, we aim even at that which is *best*. *That* we do, but we leave not *this* undone. This is our position, and is it not the true one?

Hear then the conclusion of the whole matter, and the sum

of what we need and ask. Give us Christian schools—schools which have a God, a Saviour, a Holy Spirit, a Bible, and hymn-book, a catechism and prayer, a pastor and a pious school teacher—a school between the family and the Church, a school which will carry forward the education of children in the same spirit in which it was commenced by pious parents—a school that will be a nursery to the Church—a school so entirely under the control of the Church, that it may carry out the spirit of its great commission in reference to its own children: “Feed my lambs.”

H. H.

Lancaster, Pa.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

A CONTRAST, between the Erroneous Assertions of Professor Schaff, and the Testimony of Credible Ecclesiastical Historians, in regard to the State of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages; By J. J. Janeway, D.D., New Brunswick, N. J. 1853. pp. 37.

THE above “humble performance” is intended as a contribution to our Theological Literature, with a more especial design to stir up Protestants to a more zealous defence of their cause. Having a direct bearing upon the great Church question, which is now confessedly engaging the attention of the most earnest minds in the Christian world, it may well challenge attention. We obtained our first knowledge of its existence from a favorable, if not flattering, notice of it in one of our prominent religious papers. It is rather a singular work; and were not the state of the case so very plain to the contrary, one might almost be led to suspect, that it was designed as a burlesque on modern controversy. The title-page makes a somewhat threatening parade, then follows the advertisement, and after this comes the main body of the work. It is made up entirely of quotations from Mosheim’s Church History, except about a page more or less from Edgar’s Variations, and perhaps two or three pages purporting to be from the author’s own pen. The whole work is divided into seven distinct and separate chapters, the second of which alone makes nearly an entire page. We ought not, however, to find fault with the size of the Contrast. Dr. Janeway has doubtless done his best to concentrate his efforts, and confine the work within as small a space as possible. This, of itself in our day so prolific of

books, is no small recommendation in its favor. On this account we could well afford to wait with patience for so long a time, for this all-settling Contrast to meet Dr. Schaff's Principle of Protestantism with the attention it demands,—had we but known, that “when the writer of the Contrast read this pamphlet several years ago, he marked with double pencil lines in the margin a long paragraph,” and would in due time give the world the benefit of his pencil marks. This long paragraph has at length been made the text of this Contrast, of which it forms the body of the first chapter. The avowed object of the “writer of the Contrast” is, to show from credible and faithful ecclesiastical historians, that Dr. Schaff has made erroneous assertions in regard to the Christian Church of the Middle Ages.

We will endeavor incidentally to ascertain how well he has accomplished what he proposes. And at the same time, we may notice how fairly and honorably he has dealt with the whole matter. An isolated passage is quoted in Dr. Janeway's Contrast, from Dr. Schaff's Principle of Protestantism, as translated and endorsed by Dr. Nevin, for which he meets with no great share of favor in that “humble performance.” This single passage is made to represent Dr. Schaff's theory of the Church, of Church government, the arts, science and politics of the mediæval period. Alongside of this is mustered in formidable array five or six—not very long—chapters of quotations, as has been already stated, from Mosheim and Edgar. According to this arrangement there is, to be sure, *contrast* enough shown; but does this prove that Dr. Schaff has made erroneous assertions in regard to the Christian Church of the Middle Ages? In a one-sided and prejudiced view of the case, such as Dr. Janeway and others may perhaps honestly entertain, this may seem to have been fairly done: but the common principle of honorable controversy, acknowledged as holding on all sides, answers in a decided negative. Dr. Schaff's own words, even in the Principle of Protestantism itself—in which this long paragraph was so long ago well marked with double pencil lines—as well as elsewhere, say as plainly as language can make it, that his view of the Christian Church of the Middle Ages has been given only in part, and thus in its generalized sense is most grossly misrepresented by this contrast. No picture is all shades; these serve only to make up a necessary part of a well represented painting, in which light, colors, and shades are made to blend harmoniously together. The artist

does not put on all the shading and coloring with the same pencil at one stroke. So, too, no one age of the world's life is so exceedingly bad as to be altogether destitute of some redeeming traits: nor is there, on the other hand, any so transcendently glorious that it does not contain at the same time much that is in itself considered evil. The vulture's bill of prejudice might find, in any age of the world, enough of evil, which, if picked out into one mass, would sicken the philanthropist, and kill all his high hopes for his species. Or, in any period of the Church, not excepting modern Protestantism, the keen eye of detraction and infidelity—as a Gibbon has done—might point out imperfections, impurities, and corruptions, which, although they make the heart of the Christian bleed, cannot be denied or covered. Our own most glorified and self-exalted Nineteenth Century could thus afford no less material for a *contrast*, when viewed in its different aspects, than do the Middle Ages as represented in their different phases by historians whose stand-points give them each a different view. Thus Dr. Schaff, considering either side, so far as it was a one-sided view, only part of the truth, endeavored to take a more general view; and in portraying the characteristics of the Middle Ages has noticed the different sides they present. He could not do this all in one sentence or a single paragraph; for this would have made it rather long. In that long double pencil lined paragraph, therefore, to which Dr. Janeway takes exception, he has sketched their brighter side. True, indeed, as this may be, and well as it may be supported by other authorities, it may nevertheless seem strongly in contrast with Mosheim's view, which was taken from a different stand-point. But does this therefore prove what the writer of the *Contrast* proposes?

With just as much fairness and truth, a contrast equally strong might be as plainly shown between quotations from Mosheim and Dr. Schaff—only with this difference, an exchange of relative positions, a swap of sides, as they now stand in Dr. Janeway's *Contrast*. Take, for instance, the following passage from Mosheim on the one side: "It is proper to observe, with respect to the various conversions which we have been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than those of the preceding ages. The ministers, who were now sent to instruct and convert the barbarous nations, did not, like many of their predecessors, employ the terrors of

penal laws, to affright men into the profession of Christianity; nor, in establishing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs; their views were more noble and their conduct more suitable to the genius of the religion they professed. They had chiefly in view the happiness of mankind, endeavored to promote the gospel of truth and peace by rational persuasion, and seconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. . . . It would be however unjust to accuse them (the pious missionaries) on this account"—(i. e. "traces of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, notwithstanding the zealous labors of their Christian guides,")—"of negligence or corruption in the discharge of their ministry, since in order to gain over these fierce and savage nations to the Church, it may have been absolutely necessary to indulge them in some of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things which pious missionaries could not approve, and which in other circumstances they would have been careful to correct." (*Mosheim's Church History: Ninth Century, Part First, Chapter I., Section V.*)

Much might be quoted from the author just mentioned, did space and purpose allow, in regard to the Church of the Middle Ages; where he speaks of its "prosperous events," of the "gleams of light" that it still had power, even in the darkness of the Tenth Century, to shed upon "that astonishing ignorance that gave a loose reign both to superstition and immorality;" and above all, of its activity and triumphs in the spread of the "knowledge of the Gospel" among the Turks, the Normans, the Poles, the Russians, the Hungarians, the Danes, the Norwegians, &c., who had "hitherto lived in their natural state of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and savage," but who were now by the pious missionaries of the Church made Christian. The progress of "learning and philosophy," too, as given by Mosheim in his history of the Church in the eleventh and twelve centuries, would also give a very favorable, if not a high colored view of this side of the Middle period; for it was unquestionably in the bosom of the Church of the Middle Ages that letters and science, if not religion, revived. We do not of course pretend that this bright side view of the Mediæval Church is alone a full and correct representation of its character. According to Dr. Janeway's mode of contrast, it certainly might be so contended; though we do not thus argue even when so "credible and faithful" an

ecclesiastical historian as Dr. Mosheim affords us quotations, which, sundered from their legitimate connexion, might seem to bear us out in so doing. But in the way of contrast, see what Dr. Schaff has to say on the other side of the same subject. A little farther on in that same Principle of Protestantism, from which the long paragraph is quoted, we find another paragraph which reads as follows: "Notwithstanding all that has now been said, however, one radical fault characterizes the relation of the Roman Church to the world. She does not sufficiently respect the world in its own divine rights, and seeks to subject it to herself in a violent, premature way, without regard to the measure of her own development. Instead of waiting humbly and following the course of tribulation prescribed by Christ, she would anticipate in a fleshly way the ideal state 'when the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom,' (Dan. viii. 27), and when it shall be said that 'salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ is come,' (Rev. xii. 10). . . . The Papacy in the Middle Ages conducted itself tyrannically towards the State, and trampled on the rights of nations; it permitted not science and inquiry to take their own course in a free way; it surrounded the arts with arbitrary bounds; in a word, it affected to swallow up the world at once in a wholesale way. The world however thus overwhelmed, but not assimilated to the true life of the Church, has reasserted its rights in the bosom of the Church itself, and taken revenge upon it by impressing this with its own character; especially at the Papal court. Romanism forms accordingly a secular State at the expense of the free, quietly advancing, inward character of Christianity. Its worship has an outwardly pompous complexion; filling the senses; half heathenish. Even in doctrine, this remarkable dialectic process may be seen; particularly in the dogma of transubstantiation, according to which, on the one hand, the divine is revealed only through the annihilation of the natural substances, bread and wine, here representing the world, and this in virtue of the consecration of the priest, of course the act of a mere creature; while however, on the other hand, these transmuted elements, retaining still in fact their natural character, are made the object of divine worship, by which means a paganizing creature deification comes to prevail. Thus we find explained the seemingly inexplicable

contradiction of the system, its contempt for the world in one direction and its undue regard for it in another. Monkish austerity and pelagian secularity dwell harmoniously together in the same cell." (*Principle of Protestantism*, p. 140, 141.)

In another part of the same work, speaking of the conflict between the papal authority at Rome, and the imperial power in Germany during this Middle Period, he says: "The conflict grew always more violent and fierce, in proportion as the papacy surrendered itself, more and more, to the Machiavellian policy of employing mere worldly influences for the accomplishment of its end, and laid itself out under cover of the Church, to advance the private interests simply of the popes and their courtiers, directing the sword of St. Peter against every liberal movement that came in their way. Such foul prostitution of things sacred and divine to mere secular ends, carried to the most shameless climax at last in the traffic in indulgences as conducted by Tetzl, together with such hierarchal despotism intolerant of all right and freedom, could not fail to shock the moral earnestness of the German spirit in the most serious manner." (*Princip. Prot.* p. 40.) From the same source many more quotations might be given, which contain phrases quite as strong against the abuses of the papacy as are necessary to maintain a position among any respectable Protestants. Take for instance, the following: "It shows strikingly how very general the feeling of opposition to the superstition and immorality of the clergy had become that this same small, cowardly and cautious Erasmus was enabled to occupy so successfully as he did, the apparently bold and perilous position in which he stood. No one attacked the vices of the clergy so sharply with the same cutting wit and inexhaustible humor."—"True we encounter in the same quarter also, all sorts of superstition, error and abuse." This, it is presumed, will suffice to show that "the writer of the Contrast" has not fairly represented the position of Dr. Schaff as concerns his view of the Christian Church of the Middle Ages. It does seem at first view a little strange, that the passages above quoted were not also marked with double pencil lines and made to hold their relative place in the Contrast along with that other long paragraph. How did it happen that they entirely escaped notice and the pencil mark? Was it from an honest desire to represent the author of the *Principle of Protestantism* in a right light?

It may be remarked here, that general principles and particular facts are not always the proper measure of each other,

since they do not hold strictly reciprocal relations, inversely and conversely. For while the general principle will always make room for and embrace the particular facts which constitute its entity, these on the otherhand, may fall vastly short in a given case of evolving the other. So in the case with which we are now concerned: Dr. Schaff's position opposes the principle that generated abuses in the papal system, but along with this, there are no thrusts aimed in an infidel manner, at the divine character and existence of Christianity; which, it must always be our serious duty to honor and preserve. While Dr. Mosheim however, on the other hand, is engaged only to present particular facts, which in the hands of such a system as that of Dr. Janeway may be used not only against the papacy of the Mediaeval Period, but, as has sometimes been done by infidels, against Christianity itself. Without doubt, Dr. Schaff would be willing to allow the full force of the truth contained in the quotations given in the Contrast from Mosheim. But what then? Allowing all this, does it follow necessarily that, whatever else be said, if it be at all favorable to the character of the Christian Church of the Middle Ages,—and consequently in contrast with what is here represented of the unfavorable side of the same by Mosheim—must, therefore, be undeserving of credit and faith? Is any favorable view of the Church of this period, that contrasts with Dr. Janeway's quotations, by this fact, erroneous? and must it therefore be a wanton and perfidious betrayal of Protestantism? This is the question to be settled. And the affirmative answer must be given before this Contrast has any argument or force whatever, and before the charges it contains can thereby be fastened, by implication or otherwise, with such holy horror, in such true Protestant zeal, by its writer, upon Professor Schaff and Dr. Nevin.

It would really seem as though the only sure index of Protestant orthodoxy, according to the system of some moderns, is to deny that any traces of our holy religion, any germ of the life of Christianity existed at all in the "Christian Church of the Middle Ages." And yet if this be the real position of these would-be champions of Protestant orthodoxy, why not distinctly and unequivocally state the fact? If they are sure that the corruptions of the Mediaeval Church were such as to destroy utterly its Christian character and life, so that any thing said in its favor shows "Romish propensions," why do Dr. Janeway and others still call it "The Christian Church"?

Is not that itself almost as bad and erroneous as the contrasted assertions of Dr. Schaff?

The main position proposed to be established by the "writer of the Contrast" remains yet to be proved; thus far it has been only assumed. He seems to take it as a fact already granted and well established: that, because, forsooth, Professor Schaff's assertions, made in his most favorable view of the period in question, when taken apart from and independent of their relation to the whole, do contrast with Mosheim's assertions, made in his most unfavorable view of the same period, therefore these two sets of assertions do irreconcilably conflict with each other and cannot be brought into harmony; and, that therefore, the assertions of the one, or the assertions of the other must be erroneous. And which of these must be so, it is no hard matter, by his rule, to determine with infallible certainty. In accordance with that bold theory of history which is too common alas! for the interests of truth, he at once easily concludes that the Principle of Protestantism, which is grounded upon a more organic theory of history,—and especially that part of it which is favorable enough to do justice to the Church of the Past,—must be erroneous; and that those positions which favor his own notions must of necessity be correct.

At the same time that the Contrast condemns Dr. Schaff's position, it would also seemingly leave the reader under the impression that the author of the Principle of Protestantism—if we may except the translator, who endorses it—is entirely alone in making assertions, which are so unhesitatingly pronounced erroneous. Or, at best, if not alone, the other historians, at least those who are faithful and credible, are irreconcilably opposed to him, and to any position that will give us a favorable view of the Dark Ages. Now to remove any such impression, we beg leave to introduce some passages from historians as credible and faithful as Dr. Mosheim, perhaps not so one-sided and prejudiced, but whose Protestantism is beyond all question. The whole later school of Church Historians in Germany, with the Great Father of modern Church History, Dr. Neander, at their head, might here be brought forward to corroborate Dr. Schaff's position, and show what company he keeps. But since the weight of their testimony might be lost, because it is supposed to be unduly tainted with "German Transcendentalism," we shall not urge it at this time;—and besides, did we commence quoting from these

authorities, we might not be able to confine ourselves within proper limits. It will be borne in mind, in the mean time, that we have already given some passages from Mosheim himself, which appear to be quite favorable to the view which maintains the existence and vital power of the Christian Church, even through the darkest and most corrupt portion of the Mediæval Period.

We begin, then, with these quotations taken from other credible historians, where at first there might seem to be the least hope of success in searching for any thing favorable to the "dark ages." A Protestant writer, whose works are more widely read than perhaps any living author, furnishes the following: "But first, let us pay due honor to the Church of the Middle Ages, which succeeded that of the Apostles and Fathers, and which preceded that of the Reformers. The Church was still the Church, although fallen, and daily more and more enslaved: that is to say, she was always the greatest friend of man. Her hands, though bound, could still be raised to bless. Eminent servants of Jesus Christ, who were true Protestants as regards the essential doctrines of Christianity, diffused a cheering light during the dark ages; and in the humblest convent, in the remotest parish, might be found poor monks and poor priests to alleviate great sufferings. The Catholic Church was not the Papacy. The latter was the oppressor, the former the oppressed. The Reformation, which declared war against the one, came to deliver the other. And it must be confessed, that the Papacy itself became at times, in the hands of God, who brings good out of evil, a necessary counterpoise to the power and ambition of princes." Who would have thought that the American Tract Society, professing to aim at the propagation of evangelical truth, would not only sanction and endorse, but even publish and circulate, assertions such as these,—fully as erroneous as those of Professor Schaff! In the name of all that is orthodox and Protestant, Dr. Janeway should call upon the Society to expurgate or suppress their entire edition of *Merle D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation*; for it is from that work the above extract was taken, (See Vol. I. p. 58). But hear the same author again; "Meanwhile the religion of Jesus Christ had exerted on Germany" (during the mediæval period) "its peculiar influence. The third estate (the commonalty) had rapidly advanced. In different parts of the empire, particularly in the free cities, numerous institutions arose, calculated to develop this imposing

mass of the people. There the arts flourished: the burghers devoted themselves in security to the tranquil labors and sweet relation of social life. They became more and more accessible to information. Thus they daily acquired greater respect and influence. . . . The precious seeds that the fear of God deposits among a people had not been scattered to the winds. Ancient manners still survived. In Germany was found that uprightness, fidelity and industry—that perseverance and religious disposition, which still flourishes there, and which promises greater success to the Gospel than the fickle, scornful and sensual character of other European nations. The Germans had received from Rome that great element of modern civilization—the faith. Instruction, knowledge, legislation—all except their courage and their arms—had come to them from the sacerdotal city," (p. 77, et seq.) Further on the same Protestant Historian remarks: that, "Christianity had everywhere mingled something of its own life with the life of the people. The Church of Christ was a dilapidated building; in digging around it, a portion of the living rock on which it had been originally built was discovered among its foundations. Numerous institutions, dating from the pure ages of the Church, still existed, and could not fail to awaken in many souls evangelical sentiments opposed to the prevailing superstitions. Inspired men, the old doctors of the Church, whose writings were deposited in various libraries, raised here and there a solitary voice. We may hope that it was listened to in silence by many an attentive ear. Let us not doubt that the Christians—and how pleasing is the thought!—had many brethren and sisters in these monasteries, where we too easily discover little else than hypocrisy and licentiousness." (*Merle D'Aubigne's History Reformation, Vol. I, p. 90.*) 51

Now according to the standpoint of the Contrast, this historian, so long as he professes to be a good Protestant, dare not write such things and make such erroneous assertions in regard to the Christian Church of the Middle Ages. If he has not evidently betrayed the cause of Protestantism, he has at least manifested his "Romish propensions," by making the old Catholic Church to be the historial channel through which the life of Christianity has flowed from the beginning, during the whole Mediæval Period, dark as it was, down to the age of the Reformation. Had not some person, zealous for the truth, better undertake to contrast him a little with some quotations timely furnished for the purpose from Mosheim? Certainly

those should do so, who do not want their Christianity or the Christianity of the Reformation, to stand in any "historical" or "organic union" with the primitive Church,—if this can be done only by acknowledging the validity, for its time, of the mediæval papacy.

The testimony of the next historian, to whose view on this subject we wish to call attention, is the celebrated and popular English author *MacCauley*. In his *History of England*, in the first chapter of Volume I., speaking of the amalgamation of the different races and the abolition of villanage, he gives credit to the Mediæval Church in the following words: "It would be most unjust not to acknowledge that the chief agent in these two deliverances, was religion; and it may perhaps be doubted whether a purer religion might not have been found a less efficient agent. . . . Her doctrines, (i. e. the doctrines of the Church of the Middle Ages) respecting the sacerdotal character, however erroneous they may be, have repeatedly mitigated some of the worst evils which can afflict society. . . . To this day in some countries where negro slavery exists popery appears in advantageous contrast with other forms of Christianity.—In our own country this peculiarity of the Roman Catholic system produced, during the Middle Ages, many salutary effects.—How great a part the Catholic ecclesiastics subsequently had in the abolition of villanage we learn from the unexceptionable testimony of Sir Thomas Smith, one of the ablest Protestant councilors of Elizabeth.—So successfully had the Church used her formidable machinery, that, before the Reformation came, she had enfranchised almost all the bondmen in the kingdom except her own, who, to do her justice, seem to have been very tenderly treated."—"Corrupt as the Church of Rome was, there is reason to believe that if the Church had been overthrown in the twelfth or even in the fourteenth century, the vacant space would have been occupied by some system more corrupt still. There was then through the greater part of Europe, very little knowledge, and that little was confined to the clergy. Not one man in five hundred could have spelled his way through a psalm. Books were few and costly. The art of printing was unknown. Copies of the Bible, inferior in beauty and clearness to those which every cottager may now command, sold for prices which many priests could not afford to give. It was obviously impossible for the laity to search the Scriptures for themselves. It is probable therefore, that, as soon as they had put off one spiritual yoke, they would have put on another, and that the

power lately exercised by the clergy of the Church of Rome would have passed to a far worse class of teachers. The sixteenth century was comparatively a time of light; yet even in the sixteenth century a considerable number of those who quitted the old religion followed the first confident and plausible guide who offered himself, and were soon led into errors far more serious than those which they had renounced. Thus Mathias and Kniperdoling, apostles of lust, robbery and murder, were able for a time to rule great cities. In a darker age such false prophets might have founded empires, and Christianity might have been distorted into a cruel and licentious superstition, more noxious, not only than popery, but even than Islamism."

"Those who hold that the influence of the Church of Rome in the Dark Ages was, on the whole, beneficial to mankind, may yet, with perfect consistency, regard the Reformation as an inestimable blessing.—The childhood of the European nations was passed under the tutelage of the clergy. The ascendancy of the sacerdotal order was long the ascendancy which naturally and properly belongs to intellectual superiority. The priests, with all their faults were by far the wisest portion of society. It was therefore on the whole good that they should be respected and obeyed. The encroachment of the ecclesiastical power on the province of the civil power produced much more happiness than misery, while the ecclesiastical power was in the hands of the only class that had studied history, philosophy, and public law, and while the civil power was in the hands of savage chiefs, who could not read their own grants and edicts. But a change took place. Knowledge gradually spread among laymen. At the commencement of the sixteenth century many of them were in every intellectual attainment fully equal to the most enlightened of their spiritual pastors. Hence forward that dominion which, during the Dark Ages, had been, in spite of many abuses, a legitimate and salutary guardianship, became an unjust and noxious tyranny. From the time when the barbarians overran the Western Empire to the time of the revival of letters, the influence of the Church of Rome had been generally favorable to science, to civilization, and to good government; but during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object." So far MacCauley. More passages might be given, but this, it is presumed, will suffice from this author—who is generally allowed to pass for both credible and Protestant.

Another distinguished historian affords us an abundance of the same kind of evidence, from which we take the following specimens: "In the age of Charlemagne law, order, and intelligence had no sure support but religion: the popular opinion identified with ecclesiastical influence all that society enjoyed or hoped for; it was the bond that held the discordant parts of the empire together, and the Emperor joined with the pope in giving it strength and unity.—It must, however, be confessed, that the usurpations of the Church, during the sanguinary wars between the successors of Charlemagne, were almost rendered necessary by the circumstances of the time. The competitors for empire were weak and cruel, the profligacy of the feudal lords was only equalled by their ignorance, and the Church alone, preserved the semblance of justice." "The vices of this dark period are not justly attributable to popery; they were the result of feudalism, and so far as the papal system was able to exert any influence, it was employed in counteracting these evils."—"And the wise arrangements of Providence, by which good has been frequently wrought out of evil, made the revival of popery the instrument by which Europe was rescued from barbarism. Hildebrand's personal character is really a matter of no importance; his measures in the present age would justly subject him to the charge of extravagant ambition and blundering tyranny; but in the eleventh century, every one of these measures was necessary to counteract some evil principle, and milder or more justifiable means would not have been adequate to the occasion. We must not pass sentence on an institution without examining the opinion on which it is founded; and before we judge of the opinion, we must estimate the circumstances by which it was engendered. The disorganized state of Europe produced a strong opinion that some power of appeal and protection should be constituted; a power with intelligence to guide its decisions, and sanctity to enforce respect for them: the revived papacy seemed an institution suited to these conditions, and under the circumstances it was capable of being rendered the great instrument for reforming civil society. Hildebrand's own writings prove that his design was to render the papacy such an institution as we have described; it was indeed a beautiful theory to base power upon intelligence, and concentrate both in the Church.—To extend its duration beyond the period of its utility, and consequently prepare the way for its becoming just as mischievous as the evils it had been devised to counteract," was the mistake

made by Hildebrand and his successors. (See Dr. Taylor's *Modern History*, revised by Rev. Dr. Henry, Chapter IV. Section II.)

With the citation of but one authority more, we will bring these quotations to an end. Here is the testimony on this matter of the illustrious French author, M. Guizot, who is one of the champions of Protestantism in his own country. He says the history of the Church of the Middle Ages gave "the most decisive proof of the life and moral activity which reigned within her; a life stormy, painful, sown with perils, with errors and crimes—yet splendid and mighty, and which has given place to the noblest development of intelligence and mind. The spiritual order, at this time, comprised all the intelligence of the age, every possible development of the human mind. There was but one science, *theology*; but one spiritual order, the theological; all the other sciences, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, and even music, centered in theology. The spiritual power, finding itself thus in possession of all the intelligence of the age, at the head of all intellectual activity, was naturally led to arrogate to itself the government of the world. Temporal power, at the epoch of which we are speaking, was mere brutal force, a system of rapine and violence. The Church, however imperfect might be her notions of morality and justice, was infinitely superior to a temporal government such as this; and the cry of the people continually urged her to take its place. When a pope or a bishop proclaimed that a sovereign had lost his rights, that his subjects were released from their oath of fidelity, this interference, though undoubtedly liable to the greatest abuses, was often, in the particular case to which it was directed, just and salutary. It generally holds, indeed, that where liberty is wanting, religion, in a great measure, supplies its place. In the Tenth Century, the oppressed nations were not in a state to protect themselves, to defend their rights against civil violence—religion, in the name of Heaven, placed itself between them."

"The influence of the Church, moreover, has given to the development of the human mind, in our modern world, an extent and variety which it never possessed elsewhere. Notwithstanding all the evil, all the abuses, which may have crept into the Church—notwithstanding all the acts of tyranny of which she has been guilty, we must still acknowledge her influence upon the progress of the human intellect, to have been beneficial; that she has assisted in its development rather

than in its compression, in its extension rather than in its confinement." Again: "The intellectual and moral progress of Europe has been essentially theological. Look at its history from the fifth to the sixteenth century, and you will find throughout, that theology has possessed and directed the human mind; every idea is impressed with theology; every question that has been started, whether philosophical, political, or historical, has been considered in a religious point of view. So powerful, indeed, has been the authority of the Church in matters of intellect, that even the mathematical and physical sciences have been obliged to submit to its doctrine. The spirit of theology has been, as it were, the blood which has circulated in the veins of the European world down to the time of Bacon and Descartes. Bacon in England and Descartes in France, were the first who carried the human mind out of the pale of theology. We shall find the same fact hold if we travel through the regions of literature; the habit, the sentiments, the language of theology there show themselves at every step. This influence taken altogether has been salutary. It not only kept up and ministered to the intellectual movement in Europe, but the system of doctrines and precepts, by whose authority it stamped its impress upon that movement, was incalculably superior to any which the ancient world had known." (*M. Guizot's Civilization in Modern Europe*, Lect. V. and VI.)

We have doubtless already, in the opinion of the reader who has followed us thus far, given enough in the form of quotations. The plan of the Contrast gives us ample license for this and much more. As multiplying extracts from the above authorities, or similar ones, would only be repeating in another form what has already been said—and said to the point, we forbear. In the great abundance of matter and number of authors that might be quoted, it is difficult, since we have commenced, to know what to choose and what to omit. It would be useless, to cite more than enough to establish the validity of the assertions and position of the Principle of Protestantism, to which the Contrast takes exception. As already stated we have purposely refrained from giving any thing from the many modern German authorities, because, on account of undue prejudice their testimony might be undervalued. Those we have given, like the mouth of the Great American statesman and orator, will speak for themselves. Any one who will read them, either as here given in their disconnected and con-

denser form ; or more fully, in their connexion, as they stand in the authorities from which they have been taken, will be brought in all fairness to acknowledge the wide difference between the view of the Mediæval Church as here presented, and that impliedly set forth in the Contrast. The same historic facts hold for the advocates of both theories. That there existed, abstractly considered, much mental darkness, gross ignorance, and error in those times, especially in the tenth century ; that they teemed with evils, corruptions and abuses in the religious life ; that various vices and immoralities rioted in almost all the social relations ; and that anarchy, violence, and tyranny held sway in the departments of government and law—are all facts not brought into question. This, the plain and indisputable account of history seems to require to be fully admitted. But this alone would only give us a one-sided view of history, representing merely its negative and destructive factor ; whether it be taken in respect to civilization or religion. Without an organic view of history, it is absolutely meaningless : its facts must stand in connexion with its general law by which they must be interpreted, in order to be understood. Nothing is gained, therefore, in a case like this with which we are now concerned, by denying, on the one hand, the well established facts of history, or by entirely suppressing their legitimate significance or warping that to suit a particular purpose, on the other. The great ground of difference between these two theories, then, appears to consist in the relation these given facts are made to hold in the life of history. Whilst the one, attributes to the influence of the Christian Church all the evils that disgrace and blacken the historic records of these “dark ages ;” the other denies the force and fairness of the charge, and contends that it is not only a gross misrepresentation of history itself, but at the same it is also an insult and wrong to our common Christianity. The religion which bears the name of our Divine Lord, to be true to itself, should also bear the impress of His character. But if the Church was totally corrupt, it could then produce only evil ; and it is steadily affirmed by some that such it was, and that therefore any principles of good that might be found in those or after times, of course, sprang from some other quarter foreign to that body which still claimed to be the body of Christ. But *whence*, then, came that which opposed the evil and produced the good ? For, there were evidently some elements of good at work, at the worst stage of things ;—producing in the

those should do so, who do not want their Christianity or the Christianity of the Reformation, to stand in any "historical" or "organic union" with the primitive Church,—if this can be done only by acknowledging the validity, for its time, of the mediæval papacy.

The testimony of the next historian, to whose view on this subject we wish to call attention, is the celebrated and popular English author *MacCauley*. In his *History of England*, in the first chapter of Volume I., speaking of the amalgamation of the different races and the abolition of villanage, he gives credit to the Mediæval Church in the following words: "It would be most unjust not to acknowledge that the chief agent in these two deliverances, was religion; and it may perhaps be doubted whether a purer religion might not have been found a less efficient agent. . . . Her doctrines, (i. e. the doctrines of the Church of the Middle Ages) respecting the sacerdotal character, however erroneous they may be, have repeatedly mitigated some of the worst evils which can afflict society. . . . To this day in some countries where negro slavery exists popery appears in advantageous contrast with other forms of Christianity.—In our own country this peculiarity of the Roman Catholic system produced, during the Middle Ages, many salutary effects.—How great a part the Catholic ecclesiastics subsequently had in the abolition of villanage we learn from the unexceptionable testimony of Sir Thomas Smith, one of the ablest Protestant councilors of Elizabeth. —So successfully had the Church used her formidable machinery, that, before the Reformation came, she had enfranchised almost all the bondmen in the kingdom except her own, who, to do her justice, seem to have been very tenderly treated." —"Corrupt as the Church of Rome was, there is reason to believe that if the Church had been overthrown in the twelfth or even in the fourteenth century, the vacant space would have been occupied by some system more corrupt still. There was then through the greater part of Europe, very little knowledge, and that little was confined to the clergy. Not one man in five hundred could have spelled his way through a psalm. Books were few and costly. The art of printing was unknown. Copies of the Bible, inferior in beauty and clearness to those which every cottager may now command, sold for prices which many priests could not afford to give. It was obviously impossible for the laity to search the Scriptures for themselves. It is probable therefore, that, as soon as they had put off one spiritual yoke, they would have put on another, and that the

power lately exercised by the clergy of the Church of Rome would have passed to a far worse class of teachers. The sixteenth century was comparatively a time of light; yet even in the sixteenth century a considerable number of those who quitted the old religion followed the first confident and plausible guide who offered himself, and were soon led into errors far more serious than those which they had renounced. Thus Mathias and Kniperdoling, apostles of lust, robbery and murder, were able for a time to rule great cities. In a darker age such false prophets might have founded empires, and Christianity might have been distorted into a cruel and licentious superstition, more noxious, not only than popery, but even than Islamism."

"Those who hold that the influence of the Church of Rome in the Dark Ages was, on the whole, beneficial to mankind, may yet, with perfect consistency, regard the Reformation as an inestimable blessing.—The childhood of the European nations was passed under the tutelage of the clergy. The ascendancy of the sacerdotal order was long the ascendancy which naturally and properly belongs to intellectual superiority. The priests, with all their faults were by far the wisest portion of society. It was therefore on the whole good that they should be respected and obeyed. The encroachment of the ecclesiastical power on the province of the civil power produced much more happiness than misery, while the ecclesiastical power was in the hands of the only class that had studied history, philosophy, and public law, and while the civil power was in the hands of savage chiefs, who could not read their own grants and edicts. But a change took place. Knowledge gradually spread among laymen. At the commencement of the sixteenth century many of them were in every intellectual attainment fully equal to the most enlightened of their spiritual pastors. Hence forward that dominion which, during the Dark Ages, had been, in spite of many abuses, a legitimate and salutary guardianship, became an unjust and noxious tyranny. From the time when the barbarians overran the Western Empire to the time of the revival of letters, the influence of the Church of Rome had been generally favorable to science, to civilization, and to good government; but during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object." So far MacCauley. More passages might be given, but this, it is presumed, will suffice from this author—who is generally allowed to pass for both credible and Protestant.

Another distinguished historian affords us an abundance of the same kind of evidence, from which we take the following specimens: "In the age of Charlemagne law, order, and intelligence had no sure support but religion: the popular opinion identified with ecclesiastical influence all that society enjoyed or hoped for; it was the bond that held the discordant parts of the empire together, and the Emperor joined with the pope in giving it strength and unity.—It must, however, be confessed, that the usurpations of the Church, during the sanguinary wars between the successors of Charlemagne, were almost rendered necessary by the circumstances of the time. The competitors for empire were weak and cruel, the profligacy of the feudal lords was only equalled by their ignorance, and the Church alone, preserved the semblance of justice." "The vices of this dark period are not justly attributable to popery; they were the result of feudalism, and so far as the papal system was able to exert any influence, it was employed in counteracting these evils."—"And the wise arrangements of Providence, by which good has been frequently wrought out of evil, made the revival of popery the instrument by which Europe was rescued from barbarism. Hildebrand's personal character is really a matter of no importance; his measures in the present age would justly subject him to the charge of extravagant ambition and blundering tyranny; but in the eleventh century, every one of these measures was necessary to counteract some evil principle, and milder or more justifiable means would not have been adequate to the occasion. We must not pass sentence on an institution without examining the opinion on which it is founded; and before we judge of the opinion, we must estimate the circumstances by which it was engendered. The disorganized state of Europe produced a strong opinion that some power of appeal and protection should be constituted; a power with intelligence to guide its decisions, and sanctity to enforce respect for them: the revived papacy seemed an institution suited to these conditions, and under the circumstances it was capable of being rendered the great instrument for reforming civil society. Hildebrand's own writings prove that his design was to render the papacy such an institution as we have described; it was indeed a beautiful theory to base power upon intelligence, and concentrate both in the Church.—To extend its duration beyond the period of its utility, and consequently prepare the way for its becoming just as mischievous as the evils it had been devised to counteract," was the mistake

made by Hildebrand and his successors. (See Dr. Taylor's *Modern History*, revised by Rev. Dr. Henry, Chapter IV. Section II.)

With the citation of but one authority more, we will bring these quotations to an end. Here is the testimony on this matter of the illustrious French author, M. Guizot, who is one of the champions of Protestantism in his own country. He says the history of the Church of the Middle Ages gave "the most decisive proof of the life and moral activity which reigned within her; a life stormy, painful, sown with perils, with errors and crimes—yet splendid and mighty, and which has given place to the noblest development of intelligence and mind. The spiritual order, at this time, comprised all the intelligence of the age, every possible development of the human mind. There was but one science, *theology*; but one spiritual order, the theological; all the other sciences, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, and even music, centered in theology. The spiritual power, finding itself thus in possession of all the intelligence of the age, at the head of all intellectual activity, was naturally led to arrogate to itself the government of the world. Temporal power, at the epoch of which we are speaking, was mere brutal force, a system of rapine and violence. The Church, however imperfect might be her notions of morality and justice, was infinitely superior to a temporal government such as this; and the cry of the people continually urged her to take its place. When a pope or a bishop proclaimed that a sovereign had lost his rights, that his subjects were released from their oath of fidelity, this interference, though undoubtedly liable to the greatest abuses, was often, in the particular case to which it was directed, just and salutary. It generally holds, indeed, that where liberty is wanting, religion, in a great measure, supplies its place. In the Tenth Century, the oppressed nations were not in a state to protect themselves, to defend their rights against civil violence—religion, in the name of Heaven, placed itself between them."

"The influence of the Church, moreover, has given to the development of the human mind, in our modern world, an extent and variety which it never possessed elsewhere. Notwithstanding all the evil, all the abuses, which may have crept into the Church—notwithstanding all the acts of tyranny of which she has been guilty, we must still acknowledge her influence upon the progress of the human intellect, to have been beneficial; that she has assisted in its development rather

than in its compression, in its extension rather than in its confinement." Again: "The intellectual and moral progress of Europe has been essentially theological. Look at its history from the fifth to the sixteenth century, and you will find throughout, that theology has possessed and directed the human mind; every idea is impressed with theology; every question that has been started, whether philosophical, political, or historical, has been considered in a religious point of view. So powerful, indeed, has been the authority of the Church in matters of intellect, that even the mathematical and physical sciences have been obliged to submit to its doctrine. The spirit of theology has been, as it were, the blood which has circulated in the veins of the European world down to the time of Bacon and Descartes. Bacon in England and Descartes in France, were the first who carried the human mind out of the pale of theology. We shall find the same fact hold if we travel through the regions of literature; the habit, the sentiments, the language of theology there show themselves at every step. This influence taken altogether has been salutary. It not only kept up and ministered to the intellectual movement in Europe, but the system of doctrines and precepts, by whose authority it stamped its impress upon that movement, was incalculably superior to any which the ancient world had known." (*M. Guizot's Civilization in Modern Europe*, Lect. V. and VI.)

We have doubtless already, in the opinion of the reader who has followed us thus far, given enough in the form of quotations. The plan of the Contrast gives us ample license for this and much more. As multiplying extracts from the above authorities, or similar ones, would only be repeating in another form what has already been said—and said to the point, we forbear. In the great abundance of matter and number of authors that might be quoted, it is difficult, since we have commenced, to know what to choose and what to omit. It would be useless, to cite more than enough to establish the validity of the assertions and position of the Principle of Protestantism, to which the Contrast takes exception. As already stated we have purposely refrained from giving any thing from the many modern German authorities, because, on account of undue prejudice their testimony might be undervalued. Those we have given, like the mouth of the Great American statesman and orator, will speak for themselves. Any one who will read them, either as here given in their disconnected and con-

densed form ; or more fully, in their connexion, as they stand in the authorities from which they have been taken, will be brought in all fairness to acknowledge the wide difference between the view of the Mediæval Church as here presented, and that impliedly set forth in the Contrast. The same historic facts hold for the advocates of both theories. That there existed, abstractly considered, much mental darkness, gross ignorance, and error in those times, especially in the tenth century ; that they teemed with evils, corruptions and abuses in the religious life ; that various vices and immoralities rioted in almost all the social relations ; and that anarchy, violence, and tyranny held sway in the departments of government and law—are all facts not brought into question. This, the plain and indisputable account of history seems to require to be fully admitted. But this alone would only give us a one-sided view of history, representing merely its negative and destructive factor ; whether it be taken in respect to civilization or religion. Without an organic view of history, it is absolutely meaningless : its facts must stand in connexion with its general law by which they must be interpreted, in order to be understood. Nothing is gained, therefore, in a case like this with which we are now concerned, by denying, on the one hand, the well established facts of history, or by entirely suppressing their legitimate significance or warping that to suit a particular purpose, on the other. The great ground of difference between these two theories, then, appears to consist in the relation these given facts are made to hold in the life of history. Whilst the one, attributes to the influence of the Christian Church all the evils that disgrace and blacken the historic records of these “dark ages ;” the other denies the force and fairness of the charge, and contends that it is not only a gross misrepresentation of history itself, but at the same it is also an insult and wrong to our common Christianity. The religion which bears the name of our Divine Lord, to be true to itself, should also bear the impress of His character. But if the Church was totally corrupt, it could then produce only evil ; and it is steadily affirmed by some that such it was, and that therefore any principles of good that might be found in those or after times, of course, sprang from some other quarter foreign to that body which still claimed to be the body of Christ. But *whence*, then, came that which opposed the evil and produced the good ? For, there were evidently some elements of good at work, at the worst stage of things ;—producing in the

end that advanced stage reached in the civilization and Christianization of Modern Europe ; raising it from the condition of savage heathenism, violent convulsion, anarchy and disorder of the very worst kind into which it had been plunged in consequence of the overthrow of the Western Empire, by the barbarians from the north and northeast ; and elevating it to that commanding position it has since attained. It will not do to ascribe it to the power of God, acting in a direct and immediate way. God always works by means. The plans of His providence throughout the universe are accomplished by Divinely appointed organs. The history of the world is no exception to this general law : its changes are produced by regularly constituted means. The question then comes up, what wrought this change ? In answer to this, the one theory affords no satisfactory reply. The other,—which seems to stand in perfect harmony with itself and Divine Truth,—suggests that it was the vital power of Christ's life working through His body, the Church, which ever remained, which still is, and which shall always be, "the salt of the earth."

The Church that was founded by its Great Head upon a rock, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, must always be a real fact. And we believe, that its activity can be traced, and that its vital power has been felt, in every age of the world, since it was first instituted by Divine authority. When the foundations of the old Greek and Roman civilization gave way before the fierceness of the Huns, Goths and Vandals, whose irresistible hordes, like mighty avalanches, poured down in moving masses from the north, the Church sustained the shock without receiving fatal injury. When the framework of the old fabrics, effete and tottering, unable longer to sustain the opposing force, was overwhelmed and fell into shapeless ruins, the Church alone had life enough to stand firm. Its Divine character rendered it indestructible. Flung into the mad vortex of convulsed society, when the wild passions of the rude nations were fairly lashed into the foam of phrenzied fury, what fate must we expect for the Christian Church ? It was then the only institution that was able, not only to prevent its own destruction, but to rise to the surface, like oil upon troubled waters, and calm the commotion of the surrounding storm. Christ was still, as it were, in the vessel to rebuke the wind and the waves : and His "Peace, be still," must ever be followed, as of old, by "a great calm."

Succeeding the overthrow of the old order of things, a night

of thick darkness set in upon the world, to which the stereotyped epithet, *dark ages*, has been characteristically applied. The great problem now was, to bring order out of confusion, to reconstruct society from these discordant elements. And, as no other institution adequate to the task was at hand, it was undertaken by the Church, whose mission, in the providence of God, it seemed most clearly to be. But of course this great work could not all be done instantaneously, or magically at once: it must be wrought out gradually in the regular order of nature, which makes but slow progress in the growth of what is of solid texture and enduring life. Through the long centuries of patient trial and zealous activity that succeeded, the Church continued to carry this process steadily forward. At no time did the condition of the world grow worse because it was under the influence of Christianity—though this itself was not always of the purest character, and in given cases fell far short of its divine, ideal perfection. The task assigned the Church,—of remoulding the civilization and establishing the nationalities of Modern Europe in a Christian form,—was in itself no mean undertaking, whose work it would be an easy matter to accomplish. From the very necessity that there was in the case, for the Church to take up into itself the elements which were to be acted upon by it; and thus to constitute and renew continually its own corporeity from that which stood in violent and hostile opposition to it,—from this very necessity, there was great danger of its being, in the end, itself totally overcome by the wild power it thus sought to subdue. And the fact that this deplorable result did not follow, argues strongly in favor of its divine character and constitution. No merely human institution could have withstood such an opposing force: none in fact did survive. And never was the supernatural character and life of the Church so fully tested, as in this trying ordeal through which it was now called to pass. As the natural body is more or less modified by the elements it takes into itself and reduces to its own constitution by the power of assimilation, making it of one substance with its own peculiar life; so too, the supernatural Church in its external realization, holding in the sphere of the human, always has been, and ever will be, in no small measure, conditioned by the life of the natural world in every age. But still, it cannot be brought under this influence in any such way, as ever to subvert its own proper life: for it is founded upon a rock, so that even the gates of hell may never be able to prevail against it.

The evils, the superstition and ignorance that existed in the world, and measurably also in the Church itself, were found to exist in spite of the efforts of the Church to remove them—and not by any patronage it extended to them. The facts in the case, as we learn from the authorities already given, as well as from many others of undoubted credibility, plainly show, that the Church through all the Middle Period embodied in itself the active and vital power that controlled the world for good,—not only in its own peculiar sphere, religion, but in all other departments also,—as politics and government, science and art, and general literature, so far as any thing was produced worthy of that name. It did not deliberately and for its own dark purposes blot out the light of the world. If it did for a while shut up within the cloister walls the little of ancient learning that yet remained after the general wreck, it was only to preserve it there—safe from the touch of the indiscriminating destruction of the barbarian's hands, till it could again be drawn from those retreats, to shine with more than former radiance without danger of utter annihilation. To the Church, in spite of vandalism, and not to the barbarians in spite of the Church, are we indebted for the remains of the ancient classics and the Bible too. *Hallam* in his *Literature of Modern Europe* says: "This state of general ignorance lasted, with no sensible difference, on a superficial view, for about five centuries, during which every sort of knowledge was almost wholly confined to the ecclesiastical order." If, as in some instances was the case, opposition was made in the bosom of the Church to learning, it was not to learning as such, but because it was profane learning, because of its heathenizing influence. The Church did not set the world in a retrograde progress. The condition of the world in the eleventh century, for instance, when Hildebrand at the head of the papal Church for a time ruled Europe, was not worse than it was in the sixth century, but absolutely much better. And we know very well that from the eleventh to the sixteenth century the advance was both marked and rapid, until it finally reached that transcendent epoch which gave birth to the Reformation. It is in fact not an easy matter to account satisfactorily for this last great movement, if things were really growing worse year by year. If there was no advance, so that, at the dawn of the Reformation, all was at its lowest ebb, then perhaps, the Romanists may after all be more than half right when they charge this epoch with affording the power of the wicked one

a grand triumph over a great part of the world. It might then properly be considered a grand stride in the way downwards—instead of being a stadium higher, as we are in the habit of contending.

The theory which we hold in regard to the Church of the Middle Ages does not make it to be the embodiment of all that is excellent in government both of Church and State, in polite learning, in moral virtue, and in true piety. But it does make the Church to be something else than a positive evil; rather, upon the whole, a positive good in its influence upon the world. No doubt the state of the several departments of government, literature and religion were really bad enough,—far worse it may be allowed in some respects, than in the present day: but what would have been their condition had they been entirely deprived of the fostering and protecting care of the Church? What would be the condition of Modern Europe, what would be our own case, had there been no Church during the Middle Ages? In the condition in which the world found itself, in the sixth and seventh centuries, could the Protestant Reformation have found place? or, could the tenth century have given birth, in our own particular form, to any such a world fact as the American Revolution? Let those give a satisfactory reply to these and similar questions, who maintain that the Church was the masterpiece of satan, his synagogue, and the seat of all the vices, corruptions, and swarms of evils in every form, that stain the character of those Ages. The advocates of this theory have many things to reconcile before they can bring their system into harmony with history.

Our own age must not be taken as a fixed standard by which to measure all that went before. Such is too often the case; and hence the too common mistake of assigning a wrong character to some ages, and of undervaluing the significance of their influence in its bearing on the subsequent period of the world's life. The factors of history are so organic that no age is altogether independent of those which preceded; so the present, could not be what it now is, had it not been preceded by such events as the discovery of the art of printing, the discovery of America, the English, the American and the French revolutions. The Church of the nineteenth century could not be what it now is, had there not been the Church of the tenth century. "The tenth century," we are told by Hallam, in his *Literature of the Middle Ages*, "used to be considered by mediæval historians, the darkest part of this

intellectual night. It was the iron age, which they vie with one-another in describing as lost in the most consummate ignorance. This, however, is much rather applicable to Italy and England than to France and Germany. The former were both in a deplorable state of barbarism. And there are doubtless abundant proofs of ignorance in every part of Europe. But, compared with the seventh and eighth centuries, the tenth was an age of illumination in France. And Meiners, who judged the middle ages somewhat perhaps, too severely, but with penetrating and comprehensive observation, of which there have been few instances, had gone so far as to say: "that in no age, perhaps, did Germany possess more learned and virtuous Churchmen of the Episcopal order, (i. e. bishops and theologians) than in the latter half of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century." What "a sad proof of declension from all sound Protestant feeling" is that!

The main channel, through which the truth of Christianity flowed from the beginning, through which it has been transmitted from the Apostolic age down to the Reformation and to the present time, the voice of history declares, is the Church. In all ages of the Church there can be found evils and imperfections enough for the truly pious soul to deplore; as can be learned from the writings of some of the most earnest spirits that have adorned the Church of the past. St. Paul and St. John found evils in the Church of their day; Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom and Augustine, no less in their times; and the active life of Hildebrand gives evidence that he was fully alive to a sense of the imperfections and abuses, that obtained in the body of Christ, in the age in which he ruled for a time, as the master spirit of the world. In the councils of Constance and Basle the Church exhibited a consciousness of defects in its own body that called loudly for a remedy; the Reformers felt this, still more powerfully in their times, and called the attention of Christendom to the fact; and the most serious and godly men, Catholics as well as Protestants, of the present day, are free to admit that the Church even now has not reached a state of perfection. To bring forward all the corruptions and vices that the Protestants are in the habit of charging upon the existing Roman Catholic Church; and then join to these, all that the Roman Catholics lay to the charge of the Protestant religion; together with what the different branches of Protestantism are continually accusing one another of—and we have rather a dark picture of the Church,

in the middle of this enlightened nineteenth century. And yet, this plan of infidel argument against our common Christianity of the present day, is no more unfair and disingenuous, than that of many Protestants against the Mediæval Church. For the credit of Christianity itself, let it be clearly stated and fully admitted, that, the Church never was so corrupt, even in its worst condition, as to make common cause with the devil,—deliberately engaging with him in thwarting the designs of Providence in regard to the condition of the world. Then only, can we have faith in "the Holy Catholic Church," as we are required, in the sense of the Creed.

Let us suppose that the monstrous view of the other theory be correct. All the consequences legitimately flowing from such a position would naturally follow. Suppose then, that the evils, abuses, ignorance and superstition of which mention has been made, owe their origin and existence in the dark ages, to the influence of the Church as such; that they existed more especially in the Church, than in the world under its own particular order; that so far as they unquestionably did exist in the bosom of the Church, they were its natural offspring, and not rather, the remains of partially unsanctified nature after its regeneration by virtue of its incorporation into the body of the Church;—and then draw the most rational conclusion. Then, by its own self-conscious deceit, by its deliberate tricks and consummate hypocrisy, the Church has not always been what it was designed by Christ our Lord to be, the repository and mediate channel of saving truth. And then its Founder and Head must have been most wretchedly deceived, and uttered a gross falsehood, when He said it should never fail. If the Church, in the dark ages, turned the truth into a lie; if it was leagued with the devil and engaged with its characteristic zeal in his service, we must confess that there is a great mistake made in the general estimate which is formed of his character. He has evidently turned this advantage to poor account. For, how the arch enemy of souls could be so egregiously duped, as to use all this machinery furnished by the Church, in battering down his own kingdom, is more than can be easily determined. Were it true, that he reigned supreme master of the Church in the Middle Ages, with the popes and bishops and priests and people, all as loyal subjects, the whole world must have been at his command. For it is but fair to suppose, that he was equally as successful elsewhere also, as he was in the Church; since, in other directions, no such

determined opposition as the Church at least at one time made, was met to retard the success of his diabolical plans. It, therefore, seems strange, under this supposition, that he, who is characteristically so cunning, should have in the present case made such a great blunder and managed his business so poorly. Notwithstanding the fact, that he held in his own power for centuries the whole world-game, which had been freely put into his hand at his will by the corrupt and apostate Church; yet it somehow happened, that he played his part so badly as to lose the chance thus afforded him of utterly ruining the human race. In some chance way, altogether unnatural and unexpected, there were some certain causes set to work, which, without the divine interposition of a new creation, have actually, in spite of the powers of darkness in a great measure, rescued the world from the deplorable condition into which it had been betrayed deliberately, by a wicked and false Church,—whose positive crimes are so vividly portrayed in the Contrast. It is allowed by such men as "the writer of the Contrast," that, in our day, both State and Church governments are tolerably well perfected. Liberty, civil and religious, is pretty securely guaranteed to man. Literature, science and art have attained no mean degree of eminence. And religion is, to a very comfortable extent, reformed—that is, when compared with the dark ages. Now, all these results, vast and important as they may be, are hard to be satisfactorily accounted for, we say, by any such infidel theory that sees not God ruling in the history of the world; especially as this is conditioned by His presence in the history of His body, the Church. For if Christianity then no longer lived in the Church, where did it exist at all? Where did it come from in the age of the Reformers? There was no new revelation made known to them. Not one of them laid claim to this: and of the whole galaxy of worthies who adorn that era, there is not one who did not come out of the bosom of the old Church. There, they received their intellectual, moral, and religious training. Not one of them came from the little sects outside of the Catholic Church.

The "Principle of Protestantism" maintains, that the Christianity of the Reformation is not the promulgation of a new dispensation: but, that it is the bearer and continuation substantially, of the essential elements of the Christian life as that held in the old Church. It need not be one in specific form with the Church in the Middle Ages—no more than this

last itself is in fact one in specific form with the primitive Church. It must be one in essence, organically united with the Church of all preceding ages; though it may claim at the same time to be a *Reformed* condition of Christianity,—existing in a higher stage of development, and being pervaded with a freer and more evangelical spirit. If Protestantism claims not to be this, it is worth nothing at all. If it does claim to occupy this position it must have some basis on which to rest its claims. And if it be not able to show this, what shadow of right has it to exist at all? What then, shall that basis be, if not the original rock on which Christ founded His Church? And how can Protestantism rest upon that, without being essentially, the continuation of what is already built thereon? Protestantism cannot be satisfactorily vindicated, by carrying it to the farthest possible extreme position, that stands opposed, in an antagonistic way, to the old, one, catholic, and apostolical Church. With that, it must hold in common the fundamentals of Christianity; and through that, must it receive the external ministerial commission and office, with authority and power to administer the sacraments and exercise its other functions. Without this, Protestantism is actually worth nothing more than a temperance society or a beneficial association. Must we then, give up all positive truths, and make our religion what the Roman Catholics assert that it is, nothing but a *purely negative Protest*? It is coming more and more to this. Those, therefore, who are unwilling that the Reformation should derive its origin from the ever-enduring Church—as it continued even in the Middle Ages,—in thus trying to defend it, rob it of its greatest glory, as well as its only claim to our respect and confidence. In order to avoid its relations to the Mediæval Church, they are willing to claim for it an illegitimate birth, and make it the bastard offspring of any thing rather than of the Church under the papacy.

In doing justice to the Church of the Middle Ages, as well as of all ages, we betray not Protestantism, if this have any legitimate right to exist. Nor is Protestantism at all aided,—nay, positively it is injured,—by traducing the source from whence it sprung. Must the present age, if it claim to be in advance of that which preceded it, on that account, to prove its claim good, slander and traduce the mother that begat it? We may justly consider our age far in advance of our ancestry, who, once barbarians in the north of Europe, thought the highest happiness of their heaven would be to drink beer out

of the skulls of their enemies. But we should not forget that we owe it to the Church, to the Papal Church of the Mediæval Period, that we are not now, what they were then. As we would not glorify the Middle Ages at the expense of Protestantism; so too, neither would we see the Reformation shorn of its strength and stripped of its honor, by indiscriminately condemning the Church as it stood before. Good and consistent Protestants therefore, may "hold that the influence of the Church of Rome in the Dark Ages was, on the whole, beneficial to mankind," without betraying their trust as *Protestant Professors*. And while it is maintained, along with this, that the Reformation has given birth to a higher form of development on the whole of the Christian life, there need be but little surprise,—in the way of apprehension and blame,—that such paragraphs are published and endorsed, as are some of those found in the Principle of Protestantism.

When the "writer of the Contrast" attempts to show that some of the greatest artists and poets, who lived in the Middle Ages did some things that were wrong, in order to show Dr. Schaff's assertions in regard to their productions erroneous, he descends to sheer puerility. Though they may have been guilty of some things which mar their Christian character; yet their productions, as eternal monuments of their fame, do nevertheless prove to a demonstration that they were all the products of the religious spirit of their age, which they represent, and the embodiment of which they are. An illustration of this, is the only purpose for which they are referred to in the Principle of Protestantism—and not to exhibit them as models of piety and holiness. Neither the genius of Michael Angelo nor that of Dante in his Divine Comedy, will likely be much obscured or entirely eclipsed by the VIIth Chapter of the Contrast.

It is now nearly eight years since the publication of the Principle of Protestantism. The charge of Romanizing tendency was made against it when it first appeared, and the Contrast still reiterates the same cry. The form it is here made to assume gives evidence, that, if this charge has not in all this time grown stronger, it has at least become more stale. We can therefore, still,—notwithstanding the appearance of the Contrast,—claim for the author of the book, as well as for its translator and endorser, a place among the defenders of the Reformation. And whenever the zealous Protestants, who now look upon them with suspicion, can so far rid themselves

of their blinding prejudice or consummate ignorance—or measurably, of both,—as to get at the true merits of the great question, we may look for better things in Protestantism. A better vindication of the Reformation and of Christianity, than is afforded in the Principle of Protestantism, will be welcomed with prayers for success, and deserve better treatment than the mass of Protestants have bestowed upon this. The Contrast by Dr. Janeway, can however, lay claim to no such merits. It has only been made the occasion for directing attention to the main subject. A regular refutation of that “humble performance” is not demanded by virtue of its inherent merits or force; nor on the other hand, are we called upon, in the present state of the case, to enter into a defence of the Principle of Protestantism in a regular way. As the matter now stands it needs none.

G. B. R.

ART. IV.—THE BEHEMOTH AND LEVIATHAN OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

THE counsel of Job's three friends had utterly failed to yield him any solid comfort in his affliction. The difficult problem, which perplexed him, as it has perplexed many good men in all ages, why the righteous suffer and the wicked flourish, was still unsolved. He still lay under the cloud, and gave vent to groans, and murmurs, and tears. At this juncture, when the highest human wisdom had tried in vain to untie the knot, God undertakes the task in person and answers Job from the whirlwind, by pointing to the evidences of his power in the visible creation, but especially to the watchful care of his providence, as exercised over the whole animal kingdom, at the head of which man himself stood. The reproof, contained in this lesson, is the same that was long afterwards repeated by the Saviour to his disciples in the words, “Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?”

The animals, described by the Almighty in his discourse with Job, are all found in the wild state. With the exception of the horse, not one is subject to man. They are beyond his control, and dependent, not on him but on their Maker, for support. And as they were then, so are they now, unchanged,

after the lapse of thirty-four centuries. Most of them can be readily identified from the graphic portraits here given. A few only rest in doubt, and that, we believe, not so much from want of accuracy in the description as from want of knowledge on our part.

Prominent among these are the *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* of chapters 40, 41; and so various and conflicting are the opinions held concerning them, that some, on this account, leaving the case of *Leviathan* undecided, refer *Behemoth*, which they wrongly take for the plural of the Hebrew noun, BeHeMaH, to no species in particular; but regard it rather as a type or representation of several of the largest land-animals (Kitto, Cyclop.). To this may be opposed, 1.) the fact that the lion, the raven, the wild-goat, the hind, the unicorn*, the wild-ass, the peacock, the ostrich, the war-horse, the hawk and the eagle of the foregoing chapters are distinct species, and 2.) that *Behemoth* is not the plural of BeHeMaH, but a noun with a singular termination, borrowed from the Egyptians, among whom this ending was not uncommon. *Phaoth*, *thoth*, *phamanoth*, are names of their months. But the Coptic word, *Pehemout* (water-bull), applied to the hippopotamus of the Nile, plainly shows its true origin (Winer, Realwörterbuch, 2, 156). And even if it were derived from BeHeMaH, there is no reason why it should not belong to a single species, according to the Hebrew idiom, as a plural of excellence, and no reason also why it should not be given to an amphibious animal as well as to one altogether terrestrial, since BeHeMaH (*bellua*) is a title just as proper for monsters of the sea as of the land (Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 755).

Others again, looking merely for vastness of size, imagine that *Behemoth* must be the elephant, as the "biggest born of earth," and *Leviathan* the whale,

"which God of all his works
Created hugest that swim the ocean-stream."

But this view, which was once universal and still prevails to a

* The translators of our Bible have followed the Septuagint and the Vulgate in their rendering of the Hebrew word, KAeM. Gesenius and Winer refer it to the *Oryx*, a wild, fierce, two-horned antelope, of the mountains of Syria. After Buffon, naturalists were, for a long time, disposed to treat the *Unicorn* as a fiction of the poets, until its re-discovery in the valleys of Abyssinia (Sparrman's Travels) and the southern parts of Thibet (Latter, Quarterly Review, Np. 47, Dec. 1820) has put the existence of such an animal beyond dispute.

large extent, does too great violence to the text, and hence, since the time of Bochart, the learned world has gradually settled down on the hippopotamus and the crocodile as the animals here intended.

Aided by the researches of modern science, let us examine the question, and see which view best accords with the delineations of the sacred writer.

CH. XL., 15.—*Behold now Behemoth, which I have made with thee.* Who is like Behemoth, which I have made *with thee*, i. e. near thee, in thy neighborhood? As if God should say, 'There is no need to go far, when the proofs of my power lie near at hand. Amongst the prodigies, which I have created in the Nile, in the neighborhood of thy Arabia, how wonderful is Behemoth!' (Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 755).

The hippopotamus (H. amphibius, L.—*ἡ ἀμφίβιος τοῦ Νείλου*, Tattius), an amphibious quadruped, of unwieldy form, peculiar to the rivers and lakes of the continent of Africa, was formerly abundant in the Nile as low down as the Delta, but is now rare and never seen north of the Cataracts. Though not so tall, by reason of the shortness of his legs, he yet equals and sometimes even surpasses the elephant in the bulk of his body. His stature, according to Herodotus, is that of the largest ox. On the Niger he goes by the name of the sea-elephant (Landers' Travels). Individuals have been taken, seventeen feet in length and seven in height. The head, more like a hog's than a horse's in appearance, is thrice as large as that of the largest buffalo, with a throat of extraordinary dimensions and thick beset with very sharp, solid teeth, twenty-four inches in length (Winer, Realwörterbuch, 2, 156). There is nothing, therefore, in the size of the hippopotamus to hinder him from ranking with the elephant or render him unworthy of the title, Behemoth.

He eateth grass like an ox. The Coptic *pehemout* signifies water-bull, and the Italian *bomarine*, sea-ox. In South Africa he is called sea-cow, and that probably not so much from resemblance in form as in herbivorous habits. Thus speaks a traveller: "If one should calculate the consumption of provisions made by a sea-cow from the size of its fauces and from that of its body and belly, which hangs almost down to the ground, together with the quantity of grass, which at different times I have observed to be consumed by one of these animals, in spots, whither it had come to graze over night, the amount would appear incredible." *Behold—who is like Behemoth?*

He eateth grass like an ox! It is something truly strange and wonderful that a monster of the deep should come forth on land and graze like an ox, whereas there is no room for such wonder in the case of the elephant, who is, besides, so far from being like the ox in gathering food with his teeth, that he is furnished with a very different instrument for that purpose in his trunk; and his proper food is not grass but the young branches of trees.

16. *Lo now, his strength is in his loins.* By the ancients the loins were considered the seat of strength. This expression denotes, therefore, great power. Cummings (*Adventures in S. Africa*, 2, 144), after giving a mortal wound to the sea-cow by a rifle-ball, had the hardihood to wade into the water in order to drag her ashore. "As I approached Behemoth," says he, "her eye looked very wicked. I halted for a moment ready to dive if she attacked me; but she was stunned and did not know what she was doing; so running in upon her and seizing her short tail, I attempted to incline her course to land. It was extraordinary what enormous strength she still had in the water. I could not guide her in the slightest, and she continued to splash, and plunge, and blow, and make her circular course, carrying me along with her as if I was a fly upon her tail." Dampier saw one place one tooth on the side of a boat and another four feet distant, and bite out the plank and sink the vessel.—*And his force is in the navel of his belly.* This may be well said of the hippopotamus. His hide, besprinkled with a few hairs, is hard, impenetrable, wrapped around him in folds, and even under the belly uncommonly thick (Winer). On the contrary, that part is the most vulnerable in the body of the elephant. There the hunter sends his weapon if possible, and there the rhinoceros seeks to plant his horn.

17. *He moveth his tail like a cedar.* The tail of the elephant is so short and limber, that Caryl and Schulteus, to bear out their theory, are compelled to convert *ZaNaB* into a *proboscis*, in the face of all authority. But that of the hippopotamus, which is thirty-six inches in length, may be justly likened to a cedar, because it is very firm, round, and muscular, broad at the base and tapering to the thickness of a finger at the end; and yet he moves and twists it about at pleasure, which is certainly a mark of prodigious strength. "The point of comparison here is not the length of the cedar, but the flexibility, as a cedar waves its branches" (Herder). *The sinews of his stones are twisted together*, or as Bochart has it,

the sinews of his thighs are interwoven, or twisted together (Hieroz. 2, 758).

18. *His bones are like strong pieces of brass; his bones are like bars of iron.* The meaning is, that the bones of Behemoth are not like those of many aquatic animals, soft and cartilaginous, but exceedingly hard, firm, and strong, like pieces of brass and iron,—a striking comparison, not seldom used also by the classic poets, who style the horse and bull *χαλκοπόδες*; and *seripedes*. In Micah 4, 13., the daughter of Zion is exhorted to make her horn iron and her hoofs brass. Now, the bones of the hippopotamus are hard beyond all others; and they must needs be so, in order to sustain the huge masses of his flesh and enable him to move with ease and rapidity along the beds of the deepest rivers. On account of this property, his tusks are preferred to those of the elephant as material for the manufacture of artificial teeth, and when struck give out sparks like steel (Buffon).

19. *He is the chief of the ways of God*—one of the noblest works of God, of this kind, *un chef d'œuvre*. The great size of his body, the enormous width of his jaws, the whiteness and firmness of his long teeth, the capacity of his stomach, his prodigious strength, his amphibious mode of life, and his extreme sagacity are all points worthy of the highest admiration.—*He that made him can make his sword approach (unto him.)* The words *unto him*, which are supplied in our version, obscure the sense. The idea cannot be, that God, who made him, can alone destroy him. The rendering, *He who made him has gifted him with a sword*, is better. Bochart has, *qui fecit eum, applicavit ei HARBO, harpen ejus, id est, applicavit ei harpen*. *HEREB*, Gr. *ἄρπην*, denotes a sharp cutting instrument, curved like a sickle or a scimeter (Ges. Lex. 366), and was applied directly by ancient writers to the incisors of the hippopotamus, which are long, sharp and curved, ensiform, made like scythes for mowing down the grass and corn on which he feeds. Tatius bears witness to the efficiency of these formidable tools by saying that he can consume a whole field of grain at a meal, and Diadorus by affirming that, if the hippopotamus were as fruitful as other animals, the corn-lands of Egypt would be utterly laid waste. Such language suits neither the tusks nor the molars of the elephant.

20. *Surely the mountains bring him forth food, where all the beasts of the field play.* At first sight these words might seem to require us to understand by Behemoth some huge land-

animal, but, taken in connection with what follows, that necessity is completely done away, as far at least as the hippopotamus is concerned. Mountains vary in their general features, from the slight elevation, that slopes gently down on either hand, to the bold, abrupt, and lofty peak. In the term, as here used, Bochart sees the immense embankments that were heaped up to curb the annual overflowings of the Nile. Whether this interpretation be correct or not, the mountains of the text were clothed with grass (Ps. 147, 8), and chosen retreats for the beasts of the field, and, therefore, not inaccessible to the river-horse. It was indeed a thing anomalous, clean out of the common order of nature, for a monster of the waves thus to climb up and mingle peacefully with his terrestrial brethren on the pastures of the upland. So we have him represented in this verse, but in the next, under circumstances widely different.

21, 21. *He lieth under the shady trees, in the covert of the reed, and fens. The shady trees cover him with their shadow; the willows of the brook compass him about.* The following extract from Cummings' *Adventures in South Africa* (2, 139) is sufficient to confirm the truthfulness and picturesque beauty of this description. "Hereabouts I found fresh spoor of hippopotami of the preceding night. I followed this spoor to a considerable distance along the margin of the river, and at last came upon the troop. They were lying in a shady and sequestered bend of the river, beneath some gigantic shady trees. In this place the water in heavy floods had thrown up large banks of sand, in which they had hollowed out their beds. The spot was surrounded with dense underwood and reeds, and adjacent to a very deep and broad stream, into which their footpaths led in every direction." The fens, and trees, and reeds, and willows, and papyri on the shores of the Nile likewise afforded numberless haunts of the same kind, where an elephant would be sought for in vain.

23. *Behold he drinketh up a river, and hasteth not: he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth, or, according to Bochart, Ecce premat cum fluvius non trepidat, securus erit, quamvis erumpat Jordanes super os ejus.* Why should he fear to encounter any flood, even an impetuous Jordan, when swollen to the full? Let it break over his mouth. It is his own native element. Into it he plunges deliberately and paces along the bottom of the torrent, or the channel of the sea, with the same composure as in the open air. Travellers in

boats have often looked down on him thus walking at great depths in the clear water. The elephant may perhaps ford a river, but will not stem one that is deep and violent.

24. *He taketh it with his eyes; his nose pierceth through snares.* Bochart's version is, *In oculis ejus quis capiet eum, et hamis perforabit nasum?* Who will take him in his eyes, by open force, without treachery, or trap? No animal is more shy and cunning than the hippopotamus. Though sometimes killed by stratagem, or the all-conquering modern rifle, he is seldom taken alive. Tamed he has never been. The lion, the tiger, the elephant and the rhinoceros appear in all our menageries and zoological gardens, but Behemoth still roves as a free lord over his own domain. The barbaric sports of imperial Rome were indeed made more horrid by his occasional presence, but so rarely as not to weaken the force of these remarks in the least.

CH. XLI, 1.—*Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook? or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?* The etymology of LiVYaTHaN, of which THaN, THaNiN, and THaNiM are synonyms, would seem to designate some gigantic reptile, and not the whale, as popular tradition has it with Milton in his famous lines:

part huge of balk,
Wallowing unwieldy, enormous in their gait,
Tempest the ocean: there Leviathan,
Hugest of living creatures on the deep
Stretched like a promontory sleeps, or swims
And seems a moving land, and at his gills
Draws in, and at his trunk spouts out a sea.

A student of the Bible in our day, ignorant or forgetful of the state of knowledge among the ancients, in reading how Leviathan plays (Ps. 104, 25) among "creeping things innumerable" in "the great and wide sea," where ships go, would at once think of the whale. But as sailing near the coast was practised at that remote era, the art of navigation being yet in its infancy, and as the crocodile was found in the mouths of the Nile, and along the shores in the neighborhood, and thus in the direct highway of commerce, the language would be just as appropriate for him as for the whale. There is nothing then in this passage to invalidate the proof that Leviathan is the Egyptian crocodile.* Besides, it is not fair to measure the

* In Gen. 1, 25, our version has "great whales" for THaNiNIM. The

Hebrew *Yam* (sea) by our geographical standard, since it was often applied to great rivers, like the Nile and the Euphrates (Is. 19, 5. Nah. 3, 8. Ez. 32, 2). The prophetic symbol of the land of Egypt, or rather of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, was Leviathan, or the crocodile of his own river (Ps. 74, 13. Ez. 24, 4, 32, 2. Havernick, Com. 503). The Crocodile was also the Arabic title of Pharaoh, and by Leviathan the Talmudists always understood the same animal (Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 791).

The Nilotic crocodile (*Lacerta Crocodilus*, L.) abounds in most of the rivers of Africa. Formerly it was wont to descend to the Delta, but now inhabits the Nile only toward Upper Egypt, where it is extremely hot. There it attains its greatest size, reaching a length of thirty feet and upwards, with a girth of body equal to that of an ox. "The very name of crocodile," says Cuvier, "excites the idea of an animal alike formidable for its size and ferocity; of an animal unequalled in its own orders, and which is the tyrant of the fresh waters of the equinoxial zone, both in the old and the new world."

Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a hook? The extraordinary size and strength of the crocodile are here taught, in genuine oriental style, by a series of questions, through all which we find running a vein of irony. *Canst thou draw him out with a hook?* The common apparatus of the fisherman is not strong enough for such an exploit. He often carries off bait, tackle, and all, of his own accord. Hasselquist, in dissecting one, found two hooks in the stomach and another in the thick membrane of the palate. *Or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?* The ancients erroneously believed him to be destitute of a tongue. Such an organ he indeed has, but, being short, thick, and adherent to the very tip, it is easily overlooked by the careless observer.

2. *Canst thou put a hook into his nose, or bore his jaw through with a thorn?* alludes doubtless to a custom prevalent among the Egyptian fishermen from time immemorial. Into the jaws of the larger fish, as caught, they put strong hooks or iron rings, and then cast them back into the flood, where they were kept alive until needed (Bruce's Travels). A secondary meaning of *HOHa* (thorn) is hook, or iron ring. It denotes also an instrument of a similar shape which was used

Septuagint, which the Vulgate follows, has *τα κρητα τα μυαλα*. The signification of *κρητα* is vague, and by the word in this place we ought probably to understand all great aquatic animals.

for securing prisoners (2 Chron. 33, 11. Am. 4, 2). Some commentators, as Vansittart and Harris, think that these two verses describe the sacred crocodile as led about, loaded with costly rings and ornaments, but such a forced construction impairs the beauty of the whole description, which throughout regards the monster in a state of nature, just as he came from the hand of God.

3, 4. *Will he make many supplications to thee? Will he speak soft words unto thee? Will he make a covenant with thee? Wilt thou take him for a servant forever?* These words contain an elegant allusion to the conduct of captives taken in war, who bend the knee at the feet of their conquerors, and beg for life on any conditions.

5. *Wilt thou play with him as a bird? Wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?* The savage ferocity of the crocodile is well known. A story is told of an Egyptian woman, who brought home a young one as a household pet, a play-mate for her son. They lived peaceably together, until the animal gained size and strength enough to seize the boy and devour him. Human beings, children particularly, as well as dogs and cattle, coming down to the water's edge, have often been suddenly surprised and dragged in by the hungry monster. It is only when kept gorged with food that he is comparatively harmless. As soon as the supply ceases his native ferocity returns and he becomes highly dangerous to all in his neighborhood. The Egyptian priests were fully aware of this fact, and hence, to the great astonishment of the multitude, were able to bring forth, on occasions of public solemnity, the sacred individuals, who were fed in the basins or lakes of their temples.*

6. *Shall thy companions make a banquet of him? Shall they part him among the merchants?* The rendering of Gesenius is, (If) companions, i. e. *associated fishermen*, spread snares for him, shall they distribute him (taken) among the merchants? These words are probably ironical, and do not refer so much to the unsavoriness of his flesh as to the difficulty of his capture. And this seems to be the main idea of this whole strain of interrogatories. In some parts of Egypt divine honors were paid to the crocodile as their embalmed remains show to this day. They were worshipped in Arsinoe,

* It is said that this crocodile was smaller, and did not belong to the same species as the common crocodile. The name given to it was *Souchi*, or *Souc* [Cuv. Rept. note, p. 104].

Thebes, and Memphis. At the latter city "the sacred individual was reared with the greatest care, and nourished with abundant food. Sacrifices and offerings were presented to him; he was adorned with trinkets, and lodged in a lake or basin in the midst of the temple. But in other districts of the country he was held in abhorrence, and hunted and killed, also through a sentiment of religion; because it was believed that Typhon, the murderer of Osiris and the genius of evil, had transformed himself into a crocodile. Herodotus informs us that there was a law obliging the people of Apollonopolis to eat these animals, because the daughter of King Psammeticus had been devoured by one of them." This, however, was an extraordinary case. The use of such flesh was not general on account of its strong and disagreeable musky flavor. It was left to the negroes and the dogs. No merchant sought after it. It found no place in the market. But the same cannot be said of the whale, whose bones and oil have ever been famous articles of commerce.

7. *Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons? or his head with fish-spears?* "With the exception of the summit of the head, the entire body of the crocodile is covered with scales. He can be wounded, therefore, only in those parts where the scales are separated, that is, at the junctions of the thighs with the body, or in the eyes, or mouth." "Their skin is almost entirely covered with small bucklers, which are proof even against the sword and musket-ball" (Cuvier, Rept. p. 184). Barbed irons and fish-spears are still used for killing the whale, whose soft and penetrable skin is soon filled with them.

8. *Lay thy hand upon him, remember the battle, do no more.* A mere touch of his adamantine coat-of-mail will excite so great a horror that thou wilt think more of flight than of doing battle.

9. *Behold the hope of him is in vain: Shall not one be cast down at the sight of him?* The whole drift of the argument up to this point seems to be the extreme difficulty, though not the utter impossibility, of subduing him. The priests might train up young ones and bring them under partial control, but to take him full-grown from his native element was a task beyond their power. Nothing can express more forcibly the light in which the ancients regarded this matter than the coin, which Augustus ordered to be struck after the conquest of Egypt. The device consisted of a crocodile bound by a chain to a palm-tree, with the inscription beneath, *Nemo antea religavit.*

10. *None is so fierce that dare stir him up.* No one is rash enough to attack him, even when sleeping on the sand. *Who then is able to stand before me?*

11. *Who hath prevented me that I should repay him?* i. e. Who hath first conferred a favor on me, so as to put me under any obligation? This alludes to the manner in which clients secure the good will of their lawyers. *Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine—mine already.*

12, 13. *I will not conceal his parts, nor his power, nor his comely proportion. Who can discover the face of his garment?* Though some suppose that this verse refers to the act of divesting a war-horse of his armor, it doubtless points out the remarkable fact that, unlike other members of the Saurian order, the crocodile never sheds his skin. Cuvier says, "They do not moult or cast their skin, and accordingly they thus escape a crisis, which is fatal to the majority of reptiles." *Who can come to him with his double bridle?*

14. *Who can open the doors of his face?* i. e. to bridle him. Strong levers have been thrust in vain between his closed jaws—jaws that crush the shell of a turtle with the greatest ease. *His teeth are terrible round about.* They are sixty-six in number, thirty-six in the upper jaw and thirty in the lower, long, white, sharp, and exposed constantly to view; for he has no lips to hide them, and, therefore, they are *terrible round about*. His bite is exceedingly retentive and no less difficult to cure than that of a mad dog.

15—17. *His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal. One is so near to another, that no air can come between them. They are joined one to another; they stick together, that they cannot be sundered.* These words are of themselves sufficient to prove that Leviathan must be the crocodile. Those, who think him the whale, are at an utter loss how to reconcile them with that hypothesis. Bootius goes so far as to deny that the crocodile has scales, and quotes from Arrian an old story, which is also repeated by Caryl. It runs thus: he, Arrian, had heard a sea-captain, Nearchus, say that he had heard from certain sailors an account of a huge whale, cast on shore by a tempest, which was fifty cubits long and had scales a cubit thick. What a tough yarn these ancient Jacks did spin! And how weak must that hypothesis be, which can only be supported by such evidence!

18. *By his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyelids are like the eyelids of the morning.* The eye of the crocodile is

extremely piercing and brilliant. Hence among the Egyptians it was used as the hieroglyphic of sunrise. Thus Horus Apol. says (lib. 1, 65), "When the Egyptians paint sunrise, they paint the eye of the crocodile, because it is first seen as that animal rises out of the water."

19—21. *Out of his mouth go burning lamps, and sparks of fire leap out. Out of his nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a seething pot or caldron. His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth.* The hippopotamus and crocodile, after a long stay under water, on coming again to the surface, send forth a heated breath, from their wide mouths and nostrils, in volumes of smoke-like vapor. Of the alligator Bartram says, "Clouds of smoke issue from his dilated nostrils" (Travels, p. 116). If the whale had been meant would the jets of water have been omitted? The imagery here used by the sacred poet is bold, strong, and hyperbolic, of a genuine eastern cast, similar to that employed in Psalm 18, 8. "There went up a smoke out of his nostrils, and fire out of his mouth devoured; coals were kindled by it." The animal is described as under the influence of anger or fury, in the act of pursuing his prey.

22. *In his neck remaineth strength, and sorrow is turned into joy before him.* Gesenius renders this passage, In his neck dwelleth Strength, and Fear leaps, or dances before him (cf. Ps. 29, 6).

23, 24. *The flakes of his flesh are joined together; they are firm in themselves; they cannot be moved. His heart is as firm as a stone; yea, as hard as a piece of the nether millstone.* "These similies may denote not only a material but also a moral hardness, his savage and unrelenting nature." Ælian calls the crocodile, "a voracious devourer of flesh and the most pitiless of animals."

25. *When he raiseth up himself, the mighty are afraid; by reason of breakings they purify themselves.* The latter clause, according to Gesenius, should be read, through fright they miss the way, perhaps, their aim.

26—29. *The sword of him that layeth at him cannot hold; the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon. He esteemeth iron as straw and brass as rotten wood. The arrow cannot make him flee; sling-stones are turned with him into stubble. Darts are counted as stubble; he laugheth at the shaking of the spear.* "These expressions picture, in a lively manner, the strength, courage, and intrepidity of the crocodile. Nothing frightens him.

If any one attack him, neither swords, darts, nor javelins avail against him. Travellers agree that the skin of the crocodile is proof against pointed weapons." It turns even a musket-ball.

30. *Sharp stones are under him; he spreadeth sharp pointed things upon the mire.* From the extreme hardness of his scaly covering, he pays no regard to the flints and fragments of shells under him, when he stretches out his huge body on a muddy shore to sleep in the sun. What would be martyrdom to any other animal is a pleasure to him. The verse is somewhat obscure.

31. *He maketh the deep to boil like a pot.* Bartram thus speaks of a fight between two alligators, of which he was an eye-witness (Travels, p. 116), "Behold him rushing forth from the flags and reeds. His enormous body swells. His plaited tail, brandished high, floats upon the lake. The waters like a cataract descend from his opening jaws. Clouds of smoke issue from his dilated nostrils. The earth trembles with his thunder. When immediately from the opposite coast of the lagoon, emerges from the deep his rival champion. They suddenly dart upon each other. *The boiling surface of the lake marks their rapid course*, and a terrific conflict commences. They now sink to the bottom folded together in horrid wreaths. The water becomes thick and discolored. Again they rise, their jaws clap together, re-echoing through the deep surrounding forests. Again they sink, and the contest ends in the muddy bottom of the lake." *He maketh the sea like a pot of ointment.* This refers either to the water thickened with mud and discolored, or else to the musky odor, which is discernible at the distance of a hundred yards from the place, where they congregate in numbers, or perhaps to both.

32. *He maketh a path to shine after him; one would think the deep to be hoary.* When swimming rapidly on the surface, he cuts the water like a ship, and the rough bosses of his hide throw off flakes of foam, while his tail, like a rudder, causes the waves behind him to froth and sparkle like a trail of light.

33. *Upon the earth there is not the like, who is made without fear.* All others of the lizard race are feeble and timid, and flee from the step of man.

34. *He beholdeth all high things; he is a king over all the children of pride.* Though stretched out prone upon the earth, he yet looks down upon, or despises every other animal that rises above him in stature. Proud of his superior strength, he holds all other living creatures in light esteem. Diodorus

says, "He devours not only man, but every other terrestrial animal that approaches the water's edge," and Cuvier, "The number of enemies, capable of destroying the crocodile, after he has reached the maturity of his strength, is very small."

Here ends the address of the Almighty to his servant Job; and now, after making due allowance for changes of language, oriental idioms, and the glowing imagery of the poet, we must acknowledge that the outlines of the river-horse and the crocodile, in all their gigantic proportions, shine through these descriptions with surprizing distinctness, and stand as everlasting monuments to vindicate the Holy Scriptures from any charge of dealing in fabulous monsters.

It is true, indeed, that the scene of the drama is laid in Uz, or Idumea, and that the whole structure of the poem is Asiatic, and not Egyptian; yet when we remember how close a connection existed between these countries, in very ancient times, the allusions to the river Nile with its flags, or papyrus, the islands of the dead, the tombs of the kings, the ostrich, the hippopotamus, and the crocodile, are easily explained. "Were the last two animals," says Herder, "common in the land, where Job lived, they would not have been described in so gigantic and imposing a manner. They come forth as strange and wonderful monsters: that is the design of their appearance." And again, "the mode of life, the kind of wealth, the administration of justice, the prosperity of the emir is peculiar to him: on this every thing is built. Sacrifice is known to him; but it is a patriarchal sacrifice; for Job offered it himself, as the father of the family. Arabian deserts, falling streams, wandering hordes and caravans, are the commonest images of the book. Bands of robbers, dwellers in caves, or rocks, lions and wild-asses, the avenging of blood, all the formalities of the Asiatic court of justice—a host of minor circumstances, which it were hard to enumerate, bear witness together for the land of Edom. On the contrary, the treasures of Ethiopia and the curiosities of Egypt are manifestly brought in as ornaments of foreign learning: finally, Behemoth and Leviathan are the Hercules-pillars at the end of the book, the *non plus ultra* of another world. (Herder, Ueber Ebräischen Poesie, p. 119.)

T. C. P.

ART. V.—DR. NEVIN AND HIS ANTAGONISTS.

THE Synod of the German Reformed Church, convened in Baltimore in October last, unanimously elected the Rev. B. C. Wolff, D.D., Pastor of the Third German Reformed congregation of that city, to the Professorship of Theology in the Seminary in Mercersburg. Provision has thus finally been made to supply the vacancy occasioned in that Institution by the previous resignation and retirement of its much esteemed late President, the Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin. It was only after a year's delay, and then with great reluctance, that the Church thus yielded to the earnest solicitations of one whose efficient services in the department which he had filled so long and so well, she could, at the present juncture, so badly spare. The work of rapid Church extension, prosecuted so briskly at this time by the German Reformed section of the American Protestant Church, and the great difficulty of enlisting a number of zealous laborers, adequate to the annually increasing demands, seems to make every one of her ministers an indispensable component of the particular charge he serves; so that in case of congregational vacancies, it is almost impossible to supply one important post without depriving another of pastoral services as greatly needed there. The difficulty of supplying a vacancy in her Theological Seminary is greater in proportion to the higher responsibilities of the place. It will not be surprising, therefore, that the Church was thrown into great perplexity by Dr. Nevin's withdrawal, and hesitated a year in the hope that he might yet be induced to return to the post which he had occupied so honorably for himself, and so faithfully for the Church. But as he felt justified, after protracted consideration, in reiterating his desire to be relieved, for a season at least, from the burden of his official responsibilities as Professor of Theology and President of the Seminary, and renewed his formal notification to that effect, it was at length believed to be due to his personal feelings and claims to acquiesce in his wishes.

Dr. Nevin occupied the chair of Systematic and Pastoral Theology, thus vacated by his resignation, for more than twelve years. He came to it, at the earnest call of the German Reformed Church, well worn already by arduous labors undergone in previous stations of a similar character. In his

new sphere he devoted himself to the severe and responsible duties of his Professorship, and position in the Church at large, with untiring assiduity and distinguished ability. No Theological Professor of this, or probably any other country, ever labored more faithfully and more indefatigably at his post than he; none ever better understood, or more deeply and solemnly realized the weight and value of the vast interests depending so largely upon the intelligence, piety, and fidelity of a Theological Professor. His view of the proper extent of his sphere of labor was far more intelligent and just than to suppose it limited by the precincts of the Seminary grounds, or the number of students actually present in the several classes of the Institution. Keenly conscious of the great moral influence with which his office naturally invested him, especially in the Church to which he had pledged his services, he cheerfully recognized the corresponding duty imposed by the possession of such influence. Occupying a high tower upon the walls of Zion, one from whose upper windows he could have an unobstructed and comprehensive view of the wants and perils of the city spread out beneath, it was his duty, not simply to qualify others for being wise and faithful watchmen, but to be one himself. So he evidently believed, and few, if any, will dissent from this conviction. In addition therefore to the more immediate duties of his professoral office, he constantly and conscientiously labored to warn the Church of what were supposed by him to be most seriously threatening dangers, and to direct her in that course honestly believed by him to be the best and safest. Whatever else therefore his many, and in some cases indeed apparently malignant adversaries, could or did say against him, none ever dreamed of charging him with being a dronish slave to traditional systems, sometimes so gladly seized and appropriated, to escape the annoyance of toilsome thought, and the drudgery of disgusting penmanship, and none ever hinted or suspected that Dr. Nevin was becoming obese upon a sinecure. Manifestly fitted and designated by natural endowments, for laborious study and profound research, his whole life has been almost unremittedly and always intensely devoted to those pursuits for which, by constitutional predilection, he had so strongly marked a preference. Indeed he seems for many years, if not during his whole life, to have accustomed himself to double duty. This, as an early friend and classmate has recently told us, was a characteristic of his collegiate course already. Of the distinct nature and

extent of his labors during his official connection with the Princeton and Western Theological Seminaries, we cannot speak with certain knowledge. But it is well known, that since the death of the lamented President Rauch, Dr. Nevin has been sustaining the double burden of the Presidency of both the Theological Seminary and Marshall College, and that of the latter gratuitously. The amount of actual mental and physical labor performed during this period, may be partially calculated from the numerous and lengthy contributions of his pen, formerly to the weekly periodicals of the Church, and of late more exclusively to the *Mercersburg Review*, the work of such leisure moments as the stated duties of the offices he filled allowed him. These contributions have always been upon subjects of the highest theological moment, and such as were most intimately interwoven with the practical life of the Church. And it may be remarked, by the way, that by his treatment of the various themes thus discussed, and the palpable influence which they have exerted and are still exerting, Dr. Nevin has most effectually quashed the indictment for vapory idealism, and misty transcendentalism, which several prosecutors have preferred against him. On the contrary, he seems to have thereby proven himself capable of being most significantly, and, for some, most harrassingly practical, even in the discussion of the profoundest topics. It would not be easy, however, from what is thus known to have been mentally and physically achieved by him, to estimate the amount of mental and moral anxiety, endured by one so conscientious in the discharge of duty, and so heartily concerned for the true prosperity of the Church, especially when the peculiarly trying circumstances, in the face of which all was done, are duly considered. Few men, occupying a similar position, have encountered so much misrepresentation in the prosecution of their work. And we know of no one, whose words and warnings, from the first utterance of his protest against the pernicious extravagances of the Anxious Bench system, to his latest reprehension of Leahey-itical anti-popery harangues, have been so diligently caught up and improved, and who has yet at the same time been so unsparingly denounced for uttering those words and warnings.

Nothing of all this however was suffered to deter him from firmly maintaining his position, and elaborating his views upon the momentous questions at issue, until he has fully developed his theory of the Church and her institutions, and avowed and defended his convictions of her dangers and her duties. This

done, the Church to which he has been devoting the best years and energies of a vigorous life, has felt that he had a right to ask release from at least one of the burdens resting upon him, and to seek the privilege and comforts of a temporary retirement from the more stirring and noisy arena of an official theological life. And the circumstances under which this has been at length assented to, must be as grateful to the heart of Dr. Nevin as they seem to have been annoying to some of his more violent opponents. To state, or even specifically refer to the various appliances employed, for the greater part outside of the German Reformed Church, with the professed design of counteracting what were supposed to be pernicious errors, but the success of which would inevitably have brought about Dr. Nevin's official and theological bankruptcy and ruin, could serve no profitable purpose, and is assuredly not to be undertaken for the pleasure of the thing. Their utter failure moreover to injure him in the estimation of the Church, would render such a detail doubly gratuitous. For his own solemn repudiation of the charges preferred against him, and his voluntary reiteration of the pledge of faithful adherence to her standards, always proved sufficient to assure the Church, that notwithstanding all the gainsayings of his opponents, Dr. Nevin stood truly *rectus in ecclesia*. He therefore takes with him to his retirement the most undoubted testimony of the Church's continued confidence and esteem, her cordial thanks for his past important and self-denying services, and her sincere prayers, that the Chief Shepherd may bestow upon him, in abundant measure, His richest blessings. This indeed, temporally considered, may be a meagre compensation for the services rendered. But it is the best the Church can give. And we are confident, that in Dr. Nevin's appreciation, its value will be above that of golden medals, or of silver plate.

The event thus noticed, and for which a justifying reason has been so definitely assigned, because we regard it as one of the grievous faults of the times, that men, on whom rest solemn ordination vows, binding them for life to the public service of the Church, often too lightly relinquish their calling and abandon their work,—manifestly forms an *epoch* in the history of the Church, within whose limits it has occurred, and brings us theologically and ecclesiastically to a momentary *pause*. The occasion seems therefore to furnish a fit opportunity for a calm and candid review of the important and earnest controversy between Dr. Nevin and such antagonists as have, rather irregu-

larly it must be allowed, assailed him and his theory, for the most part from beneath some overshadowing newspaper ambushade, a controversy which will now most probably cease, at least for a season. The intrinsic magnitude of the subjects involved in this controversy invests the discussion of them with immense interest, and renders a brief review appropriate. They form the very foundation of all Christian faith, and constitute the vital elements of the Church's being. For many generations English and American Theology has been well nigh all-absorbingly engaged in the adjustment and defence of the leading five points of more rigidly defined Calvinism. The consideration and development of these, either positively or negatively, have been the great burden of almost every theological discussion, as they have been the most notable occasion of nearly all the ecclesiastical dissensions by which the Protestant Church has been variously agitated for the last hundred years. And so ardent have been these discussions and attendant dissensions in which the various parties concerned have been enlisted, from the fatalistic supralapsarian to the flattest Arminian, that no time or place was allowed for the more general consideration of other doctrines. However clearly therefore the actual condition of the Protestant Church interest, in this country especially, indicated the importance of giving attention to other subjects, subjects more nearly affecting the actual life and edification of the Church, the voice was unheard or unheeded amid the din of zealous or angry debate of Calvinist and Pelagian, Old School and New School, Andover and Princeton. Amid these earnest, and perhaps vastly important, contentions for the precise form and terms of certain speculative doctrines of the evangelical Church, the still greater necessity of correct apprehensions of the fundamental facts, upon which the very life and subsistence of the Church depend, and of intelligent and active faith in those facts, was at least measurably lost sight of, or undervalued. However high our estimate of the thoroughly tested, and most prominent tenets of orthodox Calvinism may be, and however hearty may be our adherence to them, it must yet be admitted that Christianity, or the Christian Church, as a system of supernatural means, divinely devised and developed, for the moral redemption of the world, merits far higher regard, and far heartier devotion. For after all, a theoretical system, and a living and life-giving economy are not necessarily identical. Indeed there are many mournful illustrations at hand of their being widely sundered from

each other in actual life. But it is far otherwise with regard to principles and facts which concern the actual relation of Christ to believers individually, and to the Church collectively, and of them and the Church to each other and to Him. It is otherwise with reference to the ordinances of the Church and the divinely invested virtue attendant upon their proper administration, especially the dispensation of the Holy Sacraments, God's appointed signs and seals of that grace without which there is no salvation. And it is otherwise finally with regard to the actual constitution of the Christian Church,—not her outward construction, or the form of government by which her affairs may be externally managed, and her occasional domestic difficulties may be adjudicated,—but, that real internal organization which constitutes the law of her life, and conditions its historical manifestation and growth. Here we have themes, which, like the arteries of the human system, connect with the very heart of Christianity, themes which form the veritable “marrow of divinity.”

This now is the immediate character of the topics discussed in the various treatises of Dr. Nevin, which have given rise to the controversy under consideration. Laying hold of doctrines which had come to be comparatively neglected, although they were the glory of the theological labors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he has brought their vast importance into view once more, in a light which has amazed, and even disturbed defenders of the faith, moving in quite another sphere of thought, and comforting themselves meanwhile with the belief that they were contending for the only opinions worthy of a theologian's study or a Christian's zeal. The first announcement of these seemingly new themes, appeared indeed only to excite a sneering smile, or was treated with contemptuous silence. Those occupying the higher places of American theology, and especially metropolitan editors of religious newspapers, felt disposed rather to be merry at the idea that any thing really significant, or worthy of serious notice, should issue from the mountains of Judea, and least of all from the Zoar of the German Reformed Church. But the inherent power of the truths discussed soon made itself felt, and the persevering earnestness and pious solemnity with which they were advocated speedily commanded for them a hearing. The notes proceeding from a small secluded hamlet, deeply concealed in the shadows of the North Mountain, in one of the retired parts of Cumberland Valley, extended and spread,

until they penetrated the farthest limits of New England Puritanism, and aroused the attention of Protestants and Papists, orthodox and heterodox, both on this and on the other side of the great deep. It may therefore assuredly be assumed, that discussions involving the treatment of such subjects, and constraining such general consideration, must be intrinsically entitled to some special notice of the manner in which they have been conducted, and the results thus far reached.

But the consideration which, in the present case, is paramount to every other motive for the volunteering of this review, is derived from the intimate official relation sustained by Dr. Nevin to the German Reformed Church, during the whole course of this controversy, and his close identification with the Collegiate Institution with which the Association, responsible for the character of this Quarterly, is filially connected. In view of the highly important and responsible position he occupied, as President of the Theological Seminary of that Church, the Church has been held answerable for the influence of his teachings, and the character of his productions. At least it has been assumed as the Church's duty to preserve her own fountains pure and unadulterated by commixture with pernicious error, and also secure the Protestant evangelical interest at large against being overrun by poisonous streams. Those Christian denominations especially, with which the German Reformed Church is more closely allied by ecclesiastical correspondence, have held that Church under particular obligations to this effect. We have no disposition to dispute the justice of this expectation. Unquestionably the German Reformed Church is bound, by a most solemn moral guaranty, to the Evangelical Protestant Church of the land, and indeed to the Holy Catholic Church in the world, to maintain inviolate the sacred treasure of truth with which she believes herself, and is acknowledged by others, to be entrusted. By the holiest obligations is she pledged not to permit the acknowledged foundations of her faith to be moved or altered, nor to connive at the agitation and advocacy of theories and opinions, the legitimate effect of which would be to undermine and to subvert those foundations. And no considerations of strong personal regard, or of heavy claims for past services, would be sufficient to acquit her of the charge of denominational perjury and deceit, if she could be convicted of such connivance. Has she then given just reason to fear that she has been unfaithful to her solemn trust? Has she so connived at error taught, and

defended, with almost unparalleled boldness, and yet with the adroitest subtlety, in her high places, and by those exposed by their official elevation to constant inspection, as to have forfeited all claims to the continued confidence of the Evangelical Protestant Churches of this country? None have ventured exactly openly to affirm this, and charge upon that Church such guilt. And yet, as much as this has more than once been insinuated. It is not easy either to see how she can escape an indictment to this effect, if all the theological crimes and ecclesiastical obliquities charged upon Dr. Nevin, be really sustained. If Dr. Nevin has indeed revived Eutychianism, charged our Lord Jesus Christ with being a sinner, denied the divine authority of the Scriptures, rejected the Reformed doctrine of the atonement and justification, plead for purgatory, and prayers for and to the dead, advocated the worship of the Virgin Mary, taught the crassest transubstantiation, reviled Protestantism, and made common cause with Popery as far as this could be done by him in the existing premises, then the German Reformed Church, which has all the while not only looked calmly on, but refused to listen to the alarm-cry raised by two or three watchmen within her walls, and repeated with magnified force by thrice as many more without, must either be most irretrievably astute, or most perversely set upon ruining herself, and doing mischief to others. And this precisely is what some of those professedly concerned for her peace and prosperity fear and prophesy. For ourselves we feel assured that their fears are gratuitous, and that their dire prognostications will prove most happily delusive. The grounds for this assurance will appear in the prosecution of this review, in which we think it will be made manifest, that the Church had no good reason to sustain the charges preferred against Dr. Nevin, but the very best assurance of his theological orthodoxy and ecclesiastical integrity, and that she is therefore not chargeable with a breach of trust, in retaining his services to the last, and finally furnishing him with so strong a token of her confidence and regard as he takes with him to his retirement.

Retrospectively considered, the various charges brought against Dr. Nevin in the course of this seven year's war, as it has been fitly termed, arrange themselves into two distinct classes, viz.: *first, charges of specific heresies, and secondly, charges of a general betrayal of Protestantism and a zealous though cunningly cloaked vindication of Popery.* We shall

find it most convenient to our purpose to pursue the subject in the order thus presenting itself.

The antagonists of Dr. Nevin have brought five distinct charges of heresy against him, either one of which, if sustained, would be sufficient to merit his immediate exclusion from an orthodox Protestant Church, and to brand him with reprobacy to the Apostolic faith; and the patient toleration of either one of which in her midst, would justly subject the Church guilty of it to the most painful suspicions, and the severest remonstrances of evangelical Christendom. What evidence, pro and con., has been presented to the mind of the German Reformed Church in reference to the several items of this grand indictment?

The *first* charge, chronologically, (for this prosecutory controversy is not without its gradual historical development,) and that which, on account of its comparatively minor importance, may as well be primarily disposed of, is, that *the sole supremacy of the Bible as the Divine Rule of Faith for the Christian Church has been denied by Dr. Nevin, and that the necessity of Tradition, as co-ordinate with Sacred Scripture, has been advocated by him.* In other words, it is affirmed, that upon this point the fundamental Protestant doctrine of the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures in all matters of faith and practice has been virtually repudiated, and that the papal error of the divine authority of Church Tradition, or a subtle modification of it, has been substituted in its place. With this serious and alarming charge for his theme the counsel for the prosecution opened the case against Dr. Nevin more than seven years ago, at the Synod of York. It was professedly based upon sentiments detected in the translation of Dr. Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*, and their endorsement by Dr. Nevin. That able and interesting Tract, published originally by the request and with the approbation of the Synod, was accused of teaching and defending the error set forth in the above charge, "of asserting that Scripture may, under some circumstances, be undervalued in favor of human addition and tradition," and the special attention of the Synod was challenged in the case. A full and fair discussion was accordingly allowed to take place. To this discussion far greater latitude was granted than could have been asked or expected for a prosecution sprung upon the Synod with such flagrant irregularity. Ultimately the leader of the opposition, Dr. Berg, finding himself sinking in the pit dug so deep for the Mercers-

burg Professors, tried to help himself out of it again, by making the manly confession that the charge had been rashly preferred, and that it could not be sustained. It was even conceded, in the solemn and cautious paragraphs of a recorded Protest, that the Book in question "*certainly did admit, that the Holy Scriptures constitute the pure and proper source, as well as the only certain measure of all saving truth,* and occupied ground which in his opinion *was safe*, with the single exception," (fortunate fugitive, to find so convenient a covering for so humiliating a retreat!) "of that distinction which is denominated *formal dogmatic tradition!*" It might have been expected that after such a defeat, the more mortifying because of the exulting menaces with which the onset was introduced, and after such concessions, the more significant for being incorporated into a Protest, this item at least would be stricken out of the indictment, and that the prosecution would confine itself to the remaining points. This, however, is not found to be the case. On the contrary, the charge has been reiterated from that day to this, almost as often as Dr. Berg, and his friendly coadjutors in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, and "our faithful brother" of the so-called Lutheran Observer in Baltimore, have found it opportune and expedient to excite the interest of the Christian community in behalf of the Professors and Institutions in Mercersburg, or to revive fraternal concern for the true prosperity of the German Reformed Church.

And what is really the offence committed by Dr. Nevin in regard to this vital dogma of Evangelical Protestantism? What sin has he actually perpetrated, (for of course the Church, as an ecclesiastical judicatory, can only take cognizance of overt acts, or of a spirit and tendencies made palpable by such acts,) to render him obnoxious to the charge in question, and obligate the Church to condemn and chastise him for the error? Has he any where denied or questioned the Divine Authority of the Sacred Scriptures, or hinted at their being deficient at all as a revelation of divine truth and human duty? Has he any where argued that in a case of manifest discrepancy between the doctrinal confessions, canons or traditions of the Church, and the Holy Scriptures, these should be made to yield in subservient deference to such traditions, as being of higher authority and superior force? Has he ever most remotely suggested that the teachings of the Church, speaking through her adopted symbols, could or should be used as an

all-sufficient substitute for the circulation of the Bible? Judging him and his theory from the tone and character of the various newspaper and other expositions of it, through which the public has been made acquainted with both, all this, and more and worse, would certainly have to be suspected and believed concerning them. No wonder therefore that the Church, which not only tolerates but clings to a man, who holds and advocates such views, should be considered recreant to the good old faith of her fathers, by those who derive all their knowledge of the case from such warped extempore misrepresentations. But does not Dr. Nevin hold views corresponding with those expositions of his sentiments? We answer, most assuredly not, if the public and unreserved avowals of his sentiments, which have been freely spread out during the last ten years before the gaze of the Christian community, are to be taken as an honest and sincere exponent of his views. Of his veneration for the Sacred Scriptures, his profound deference to their divine authority in matters of faith and piety, and his exaltation of them above all human traditions, the Church has had such evidence as cannot easily be shaken by the alarm-cries of those who have constituted themselves watchguards of her citadels, or the anxious warnings of those who have become notorious as panic-mongers in her midst, crying ever and anon, "the wolf, the wolf," but still exposing their own nervous timidity, or presumptuous dishonesty, by failing to point out the wolf, when the Church answered to their false cry, and showed her readiness to catch and expel the intruder. Freely as Dr. Nevin has written, and frankly (some have thought quite unnecessarily so), as he has declared and published his opinions, the Church may safely challenge his opponents to adduce a single sentence, or expression, from all his writings, which, being fairly interpreted, is in the least collision with the views upon this subject under consideration at the Synod of York, and in regard to which we have already given Dr. Berg's concession. Upon what then is this charge based? It is hardly supposable that so much ado would be made about nothing, or that sensible men would permit themselves to become so fearfully agitated, or would toil so strenuously to excite the fears of others, without some reasonable show of actual peril! At least their loud and reiterated shouts of treachery! treachery! have received far more attention than would otherwise have been paid to them, but for their presumed plausibility. It was rather naturally assumed that

no true friends, and certainly no members or ministers, sincerely devoted to the interests of the German Reformed Church, or cherishing, as neighbors, the fraternal affection professed, would wantonly hold her up to suspicion, endeavor to distract her with internal dissensions, or expose themselves ultimately to reproach and condemnation as false witnesses. What motive could tempt or incite to such an unkind and unchristian course? The desire of notoriety could not justify it? No fair vindication of it could be found in strong predilections for the puritanizing influences notoriously at work in the old stock German Churches of Pennsylvania and adjacent States, and upon the efficacy of which a few ministers within their limits might build their expectations of furthering God's glory and their own renown, as the chief instruments in the hands of Providence of accomplishing the revolution in the entire structure and character of those churches, aimed at by the operation of those foreign influences? Why should puritan modes of thought, however good in their way, and puritan forms of worship and church economy, however suitable and excellent in their place and circumstances, be preferred by the posterity and successors of German Christians and German ministers, to the peace of their Church, or to the inestimable legacies bequeathed by their fathers? And yet if we take up all that is tangible, and most scrutinizingly review all that is visible in the case, we can find nothing upon which a verdict against Dr. Nevin upon this first accusation could be based. Do we ask him, through his written avowals of his opinions, Do you believe "that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are called the canonical Scriptures, are genuine, authentic, inspired, and therefore divine Scriptures?" He answers, I do believe "that the word of God, as it has been handed down to us in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, is the pure and proper source, as well as the only certain measure, of all saving faith." Do we further inquire, Do you acknowledge that those Scriptures "contain all things which relate to the faith, the practice, and the hope of the righteous, and are the only rule of faith and practice in the Church of God; that, consequently no traditions, as they are called, and no mere conclusions of reason, which are contrary to the clear testimony of these Scriptures, can be received as rules of faith and life?" His response before God is: "*If therefore there be any unerring fountain of truth needed to satisfy religious want, it can be found only in THE*

WORD OF GOD, who is himself the truth; and this becomes consequently the HIGHEST NORM and RULE, by which to measure all human truth, all ecclesiastical tradition, and all synodical decrees." (Principle of Protestantism, p. 78.) Does this import a repudiation of the supremacy of the sacred Scriptures as the Christian norm of truth and righteousness? How could the German Reformed Church condemn, as heretical on this point, the man who solemnly avers that the above declarations set forth his faith? But his accusers call for a cross-examination. They desire to ask whether Dr. Nevin has not affirmed and does not hold that, in addition to the Bible, some suspicious thing, termed *formal dogmatic tradition* (this tail-word "tradition" makes them see a bear!) "is indispensable to the completeness of the rule of faith"? We say *no*, it is nowhere affirmed to be indispensable to complete *the rule of faith*, but "indispensable absolutely as a channel for carrying forward in history the contents of the Scriptures, and to the onward development of Christian doctrine and Christian life." Is it insinuated that this amounts to the same thing as is charged, and that it savors of Rome, to say the least, to speak of *tradition* in any form as necessary in addition to the Scriptures? Then we ask these opponents, whether they and their Churches do not hold in fact to the same necessity? Or do they deny the indispensableness of the ministry, as instituted and ordained by Christ? Do they consider that Paul did not speak by authority, when he declared that "faith cometh by hearing," and then asks, "how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher?" Is not *the PREACHING of the Gospel*, held and maintained by the Church, to be the great means of heaven's appointment and choice, for the spread of the truth, the salvation of souls, and the final prevalence of Christ's kingdom? Is not the living Church set for the light of the world, and the salt of the earth, though indeed by an honest and upright reflection of the rays that fall upon her from the sun of righteousness through the medium of the sacred Scriptures? Is it not of the living Church that the Giver of this very Rule of Faith affirms, "Ye are my witnesses, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth?" With which could the world at any time more easily have dispensed, according to the plain teachings of the Bible itself, with the written word, or with the living Church? We put this question not by any means as a suggestion of the

comparative superfluity of the Oracles of God, but merely that it may present the indispensableness of the traditional testimony of the living Church, in the most forcible light. Now a legitimate inference from the terms of this charge, and the manner in which it is pressed against Dr. Nevin and the Church, is that those who prefer it do not consider the continual testimony of the living Church, by its public preaching, its oral or written confessions of faith, &c., indispensable to the prosecution of its work in spreading the Gospel and converting the world. Are they willing to accept of this inference? Can they hold to such Quakerism, or Radicalism, and yet each in their several ecclesiastical homes, stand "*Erectus in ecclesia*"? Is Gibraltar strong enough to detain a man of such loose views? But we need not ask questions which proceed upon any doubts as to their views upon this matter. The antagonists of Mercersburg do hold that the living ministry is indispensable to the spread and growth of the living Church? They have as little faith as any of us in the all-sufficiency of the Bible for the conversion of sinners, and the universal spread of Christ's kingdom; are as strenuous as any in urging, not the expediency only, but the necessity of the Church's having some definite understanding of the true sense of the Scriptures, whether that understanding be memorized or written. But what is this else than holding to the necessity for formal dogmatic tradition? And yet, for advocating this view, Dr. Nevin is to be banned, or the Church that refuses to ban him to be blockaded and besieged as a violator of the charter of union which binds together the Evangelical Protestant Confederacy of this country, and a dangerous foe to the peace and purity of American Christian Orthodoxy! Assuredly it must be conceded that injustice has been done, as well to the German Reformed Church as to Dr. Nevin, by stigmatizing the latter as the advocate, and the former as the virtual abettor of dangerous and anti-Protestant opinions upon this particular subject.

The next *count*, in this special indictment, claiming consideration, is the charge of the denial of the rights of private judgment, or of such a curtailment and limitation of this right as involves a virtual annihilation of the right itself. This accusation is regarded as far more serious in its character and bearings than the preceding. And although it is found usually in the second place only in the chronological enumeration and ascending grade, it is clearly held forth as most deserving of

all proper ecclesiastical rebuke and Christian condemnation. Commonly we find the charge presented with a solemn flourish of premonitory rams-horns. "The denial of the right of private judgment, in the interpretation of Scripture, we cannot but regard as the *spurus phantas* of those systems of bondage, Popery and Puseyism. The 'Man of Sin' would never have been able to introduce his most monstrous errors, if the liberty of the individual had not first been trampled under foot. And yet for Popery we have some respect. . . . Puseyism, on the other hand, besides grief awakens only contempt. (The proper climax is wanting, but in lieu thereof we are asked a few sentences lower down!) What are we to think when learned men, who are far from avowing sympathy with either Rome or Oxford, can speak of the 'questionable right of private judgment,' and can compare the relation of the individual member to the Church, to that of the child of immature years to its parent?" Thus did "a member of the Reformed Dutch Church" mourn over Dr. Nevin's depreciation of the right of private judgment, in an elaborate, though not remarkably homogeneous article on the subject in the Protestant Quarterly for January, 1847. If there were "babes" in the Church in Paul's days, who needed to be nourished with milk, and "little children" even so late as towards the close of the aged and beloved John's Apostleship—he thinks that by this time a travelling Church should bring forth only full grown men, able, like partridges, to set up and set off for themselves right from the shell. And he finds cause for dolorous lamentation and complaint in any denial or doubt of such ability, and that it should be thought expedient, on the part of the Church, to attempt to interfere with the freest exercise of such ability. The article is written as a review of this particular feature of the Principle of Protestantism, and a triumphant reply to it. Of course the writer gives his own interpretation and paraphrase of what he considers Dr. Nevin's view as set forth in the publication under review, enlarges or eliminates, as best suits his purpose, or rather perhaps as his sincere but very violent and blear-eyed impulsive zeal, for what he supposes to be the right assailed and truth jeopardized in the case, impetuously leads him to do, and then leaves the alarmed reader to weigh the evidence, and pass sentence upon Dr. Nevin, and the Church tolerating such a man, according to his honest conviction of their mutual guilt. As far as can be gathered from this article, and accusations upon this same point made by likeminded

antagonists of Dr. Nevin, he is charged with denying to the individual Christian all right and liberty to think, decide and act for himself in every thing pertaining to Christian truth and duty, and requiring him blindly to bow to the dictates and decisions of a Church claimed to be invested with supreme authority and infallibility of judgment for this purpose.

Now so far as the Church to which Dr. Nevin has been amenable in his official capacity, for the views he promulgates, has the means of knowing or ascertaining his sentiments, he has taught no such sentiments as those he is accused of advocating, and does not now hold them. On the contrary, he has been laboring all along most strenuously and heartily, to vindicate the rights of the individual Christian against the claims of a tyrannical hierarchy. This is the burden of his masterly criticism upon Popery, in his review of Brownson, in which he does the very thing, only with a much sharper axe, and more powerful stroke, which his adversaries desire to have done, namely, cuts with a sure and deep aim, at the very taproot of the Romish system. And it would take more theological skill than we believe even Dr. Nevin possesses, to heal the gash then inflicted, or bind together again the parts then severed, sufficiently to enable him to draw life for his faith from a trunk so mangled by his own sharp cleaver. Speaking of Romanism, he says: "The theory involves a general wrong against our human constitution, naturally considered, inasmuch as it will not allow its ordinary law of freedom to have force in the sphere of religion, which is precisely that in which it is required to make itself complete. The general law of our nature is that mind must fulfil its mission, not by following blindly a mere outward force of any sort, but by the activity of its own intelligence and will, both as general and individual. It must move in the light that springs from itself, and the power it generates continually from within. This moral constitution includes complex relations, laws, organic interdependence, action and reaction, as in the world of nature, on a vast and magnificent scale. Still to the idea of it as a whole the conception of freedom appertains, in the form now stated, as a necessary universal distinction. The theory of Mr. Brownson, however, if we rightly understand it, requires us to assume that in the highest form of religion, that which is reached in Christianity, the human mind ceases to be directly active in the accomplishment of what is brought to pass in its favor and is a passive recipient simply of foreign action brought to bear upon it in

an outward way. It does not help the matter, that it is taken to be active with regard to Christianity in a different sphere; the difficulty is that no activity is allowed to it, in the realization of Christianity itself, as the highest fact of the world. Christianity claims to be the perfection of man's life; this, in its ordinary constitution unfolds itself by its own self-movement, in the way of thought and will; but just here all this is superseded by another law altogether; the supernatural comes in as the outward complement of the natural, in such sort as to make the force of this last null and void in all that pertains to its higher sphere. This wrong against human nature becomes most immediately plain, in the violence which the individual mind is made to suffer, by the theory in favor of what is taken to be general. Romanism makes authority to be every thing and freedom nothing. The authority too is cut off from the proper life of the subject, and in this way comes to no real union with his intelligence and will. It comes from abroad, stands over him in an outward way, and requires him to submit to it as a foreign force. Authority thus is not mediated at all by man's actual life; is in no sense living and concrete, but altogether mechanical, rigid and fixed. It is from the start a given quantity, just so much, and nothing either more or less. It excludes private thought and will according to Mr. Brownson." (*Mercersburg Review*, January 1850, p. 60, 61.)

Does all this sound at all like a renunciation of the right and duty of exercising private judgment in matters of religion? Is this covert treachery to the good cause of Protestant evangelical liberty? Remember too that these sentiments were published only two years ago, five years after Dr. Nevin's heresy on this subject was first broached. Because he then denounced the self-willed licentiousness which distinguishes radicals in religion, calling themselves Protestants, to the great scandal of our cause, he was denounced as a masked Puseyite or Papist. He had declared it to be "an abominable presumption for a single individual to cast off all respect for Church authority and Church life, and pretend to draw his faith immediately from the Bible only, and wholly through the narrow pipestem of his own private judgment." Compare this with the above unanswerable scientific defence of the right of private judgment in its proper form, consider the difference in the dates of the two utterances, and then say whether the *Mercersburg* heresy has indeed been advancing, at least in reference to this point,

with such rapid strides, towards the abominations of Rome? So far again as palpable progress is concerned, the Church has good reason to believe that it will take D. Nevin longer than an average lifetime to get to Rome at this gait, unless he reaches it by the Oregon railroad and Pacific route. So far from Dr. Nevin's approving of the wrong which Rome does to human freedom in a gospel sense, he has shown himself a strong champion in its defence, not only against the infringements of the Papal hierarchy, but also against the equally perilous violence of individual, mobocratic tyranny. Who that knows the temper of the unsanctified, unrestrained human heart, or the historical exhibitions of its inflamed and maddened passions, does not know, that human liberty, private judgment or whatever you choose to term it, has as much to fear from anarchy as from a hierarchy, not to say more? There was no Romish Pope to muzzle men's mouths in France during Robespierre's reign. Neither was gospel Protestantism there to curb, with the gentle reins of evangelical authority, the madness of the mob. But was there liberty of thought, of speech, of action? Was private judgment free then, or in chains? In chains! It dared not *look* a free thought or feeling, much less utter it. Suspicion, the least suspicion of its exercise, doomed the suspected to the guillotine, and so summarily saved the poor pregnant mind or heart the tears of travail and the pangs of birth. Here is a foe to religious freedom and to the rightful prerogatives of private judgment, as deadly and as relentless, as ever Rome has been, though history has as *yet* not afforded it quite so much space or time for the development of its temper—which God grant it never may! But that this may never be, we need to be as earnestly admonished against its insidious influences, and therefore to have its true character as fully exposed, as the perils which may threaten us from a reinvigoration and prevalence of Popery in the land. This, as we apprehend him, and as we believe the Church apprehends him, is the aim and purpose, of what Dr. Nevin has said in reference to this subject. He sees and deprecates the danger of being engulfed in the Roman "whirlpool on the one side." Equally conscious of the existence of a fatal rock on the side of lawless authority and defying religious licentiousness, he speaks out in no uncertain tones of the necessity of the most cautious steering to escape ruinous peril here. This can be done, he believes, only by a proper subjection on the part of the individual member of the Church, to the authority of the

Church herself. With such subordination of the part to the whole, the member to the law of life conditioning the very existence of the body, the individual component to the community in which he is embraced, the doctrine now practically prevalent in the wilder sects, and even to a great extent theoretically contended for by the legitimate branches of the Protestant Christian Church, is in hostile conflict. True the advocates of this theory belonging to these branches, find themselves no little perplexed in reconciling their sworn allegiance to the standards of faith and practice on which their respective denominations rest, with their zeal for personal liberty, and individual right. They seem incapable of comprehending how man can enjoy the truest freedom under the highest authority, if his inmost life is only in full harmony with that authority, or that for the true and perfect Christian law ceases to be a bit and bridle, or a scourging lash, and becomes only a friendly guide, or lamp-bearing companion. And yet the necessity of some such directory or canon, or standard of faith, dare not be repudiated. What shall be done? Sure enough! Here is a sad dilemma! And yet those thus brought to face it, like not horns, ever since they have learned to know the Romish beast. What then can they do? But let these good brethren tell their own troubles.—“What then?” it is asked. “Are we to reject creeds, and catechisms, confessions and symbols? Shall we make a bon-fire of them, and just take the Bible without any extraneous help? Assuredly not. Here is, for instance, a very valuable book, containing a vast amount of most important knowledge, distributed over thousands of pages. This book has an index, a table of contents, an epitome of the whole volume. This has cost great labor in its preparation; and it enables the reader to refer to the passages and points in the volume, as occasion may require their use. Shall I tear this index out, because it is only an epitome, and not the book? Shall I burn it in the fire, because I can find all that it teaches, and more than it designates, in the body of the work itself? No; I will do no such foolish thing. Suppose even that this index is full of errors, what then? (Hear, hear!) I will refer to the book itself, and rectify those mistakes. I will prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.” Frankly and fearlessly spoken this, for a candidate knocking at the gates of Gibraltar. There could be no misunderstanding of the terms on which admission was sought, and consequently no fault can be found with any

attempt made at correcting the "Index," if by and bye some mistakes should be detected. How those stationed to guard the "canons" mounted there will bear the questioning even of their make, their calibre, and mounting, one need not curiously conjecture. But we may hope for peace sake, that all due investigations were made previously to enlistment there, so that no errors will be likely to be detected, or only such as may be conveniently endured.

Such then are the prerogatives which Dr. Nevin's antagonists ask for Private Judgment. And because he not only refuses to allow them, but unqualifiedly denounces the claims thereto as preposterous, and the exercise thereof as destructive of the holiest interests of truth and the Church, he is condemned as Puseyistic and Popish. And yet if he had held and practiced such views as the above, he would have been false to his solemn oath to the Church which called him to serve her in her highest post of responsibility. For him the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Constitution of the German Reformed Church were to be more than merely an *index* to the contents of the Bible; they were the form in which he was to receive the teachings of the Bible for himself, and the dogmatic rule to guide him in instructing others. As such he was pledged to hold and maintain them. Suppose he should find errors in them, in his opinion? What then? Why first suspect that the error might be in his own logic, or in his own glasses. And next fear the discovery of error might after all spring from some corner of self-exaltation in his own mind. And at long last allow himself to hope that after all the Church might be right and he himself wrong, or if it could not after proper struggling conscientiously come to this, *modestly* and *decently* retire to some "more congenial home." But with this his antagonists would not be satisfied. No; far from it. If he finds mistakes in the standards of the Church he must lay hold forthwith and correct them. Well would this satisfy them? Let an illustration answer. In a case of no doctrinal importance whatever, a matter purely historical in its character, Dr. Nevin did suggest, in a work published, if we mistake not, after his resignation as Professor took effect, that one question in the Heidelberg Catechism did not properly belong to the book in its original plan, and had better been omitted as not quite in harmony with its prevailing peaceful spirit and tone. That is, in a very small matter, and in a most modest way, he ventured for once to exercise the right of private judgment, according to his

antagonists' definition of that right. We all know what followed. Even the amiable and excellent Dr. Proudfit lost all patience with the man, and administered a most zealous scourging.— Really between the sibboleths and shibboleths which these worthy opponents put into our mouths, it would be impossible for the most genuine Gileadite to hit the true sound. But we may congratulate all concerned, upon the felicitous inconsistency with which these worthy defenders of the faith, can at one time contend most valorously for some favorite theory, as though it were "one of the institutions" of Christianity, and as though the least attempt at a proper limitation and modification of it were proof of lurking treason against the kingdom of righteousness and truth; and yet forthwith visit that man with swift and condign displeasure and condemnation, who may venture to put their theory into practice, in a way that seems in the least derogatory to the minutest item of their chosen creed. It is fortunate indeed, if not for the integrity of their argument, yet for the integrity and perpetuity of interests worth vastly more than any hobbling theory, that they are in fact far more orthodox and rational in their real sentiments, than they sometimes seem to be. Their controversy with Dr. Nevin and the German Reformed Church, furnishes very decided, though rather amusing, illustrations of this fact. Under other circumstances, and with other objects in view, much more caution and conservatism would have been exhibited in their defence of the right of private judgment, and their indignant rejection of the claims of ecclesiastical authority. When men have committed themselves in various ways, and for many years, to one or another of the several phases of the rabid radicalism of the present day, and find their influence and popularity well nigh inextricably involved, in the maintenance of those errors in whose meshes they have heedlessly and rashly become entangled, it must be hard for them to humble their pride of opinion, forego their love of fame, and regardless of the reproaches of those who may formerly have applauded, confess their error, and acknowledge the truth of what they had unwittingly or through blind prejudice opposed. A difficulty of this sort evidently embarrasses some of Dr. Nevin's antagonists. Not but there are those among them whose natural tenacity of *their own* opinions and confidence in the infallible correctness of *their own* views, would lead them to reject to the last, with cordial disdain, every supposed infringement not only upon their "right of

search," but also upon their right of discovering what they please. This, avowedly, is the ground upon which Dr. Berg stands. He was very candid in declaring, as he stood on the desert beach opposite the Gibraltar of Protestantism, that upon this condition alone, would he bestride the intervening strait, and take his place within the strong embattlements. Not a whisper of disapprobation dare be raised, if upon due examination of the "*Index*" of Dort, (will the excellent T. D. W. like "*Index*," as a substitute for "*Canons*," any better than confession?) some errors are detected, exposed, and corrected. They were duly forewarned that this would be done, and yet extended the cordial right hand of fellowship. Badly as the German Reformed Church needs laborers in her vineyard, we opine that that man who should prescribe such conditions, would be allowed to stand long enough at the gate to repent somewhat of his presumption. To say nothing of the cool self-complacency betrayed in the case, such conditions involve an insinuation made with bad grace by so young a man against a Symbolic "*Index*," now nearly three hundred years old!

But there is little danger that any such attempt at tinkering with old established creeds will ever be tolerated by any of the evangelical denominations, which now seem to be in theoretical sympathy with those who claim the right of practising it. The Reformed Dutch Church, the representatives of genuine Lutheranism, or the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, have no more idea of permitting the Canons of Dort, Luther's Catechism, the Augsburg Articles, or the Westminster Confession, to be reduced to the low level of a common *index rerum*, to be altered or amended according to the user's "honest conviction" of its deficiency or mistakes, when tested by his comparison of it with "the Book itself," than Dr. Nevin has of dealing gently with such individual presumption, or than the German Reformed Church would have of conniving at it, should any one attempt such presumptuous tampering with her own adopted symbols. They, and even many of those particular antagonists of Mercersburg, know very well, that the Church is invested, both by an explicit charge, and by her very constitution, with "the power of the keys," in some significant and efficient form; and that unless she did possess spiritual authority within her proper sphere, and when need be exercised it, she could not possibly maintain her integrity, preserve her purity, or even perpetuate her existence. But if the Church has authority over matters of Christian faith and prac-

tice, and is invested with the right not only of claiming but exercising such authority, then assuredly those bound to her communion, and constituting her membership, owe her a corresponding duty, the nature of which is clearly indicated by this *right to rule*. Morally, not politically, spiritually, not civilly, as members of the Church, not as citizens of a temporal government, they are under obligations of the most solemn force to submit to her authority and acquiesce in her decisions, so long as she does not flagrantly abandon her faith, and arbitrarily trample upon the laws of her own existence. Of course men that are "lovers of their own selves, boasters, proud, disobedient to parents, . . . heady, and highminded," will scorn and scout at a doctrine so obnoxious to their wilful vanity. Your Jacob Albrights, and Alexander Campbells, and John Winebrenners, to name no others whose enumeration in such a list might be deemed invidious, are of higher metal than to suffer their necks to be galled by such a yoke of bondage, or their mouths to be gagged with such an hierarchical bit. Why should not they stand up as new Luthers, and second Zuinglis, to re-reform a Church, proved by their impregnable demonstrations, to be in as great need of purification and reconstruction as was the corrupt and apostate Church of the sixteenth century? But Alexander Campbell, and John Winebrenner, and Jacob Albright, are not exactly considered commendable illustrations of the glorious prerogative contended for. And we presume that reflecting man is not to be found in either of the denominations cited above, who would justify either of those renowned reformers, for the schisms they occasioned to gratify their personal vanity, or the peace they sacrificed as holocausts to their self-glorifying zeal, under the pretence of a self-immolating offering to Jehovah-Nissi! Not one among them, unless the disorganizing radicalism of French infidelity, is regarded with more real favor than we are willing to believe it is, would yield to the individual Christian the right to set himself up against all existing law and order, excepting only what his own arbitrary presumption may approve, and so, if it were possible for him to succeed, to subvert the established organization of the Church, and throw Christianity into anarchy wild as the raging sea, and dark as a starless night.

About this, assuredly, there can be no serious diversity of opinion between the opposite parties. None of us believe in our hearts, that the Church's authority is but a powerless leaf, with an impotent confession impressed upon it, possessing no

higher significancy or force than the index of a book! To affirm this were to cut the sinews of ecclesiastical government, and resolve every act of Church discipline into the tyrannical exercise of power. But the opponents urge that there is a difficulty in the way here, and that in the perplexity which it occasions, we must be scrupulously careful to guard the right of private judgment against pernicious infringements. Unquestionably, the proper harmonizing of the right of the individual with the authority of the collective body with which he is incorporated, presents a problem which is not to be solved by a few bold dashes of the pen in the Protestant Quarterly. The concession is gladly accepted, and it is hoped, for candor's sake, it will never be recalled. But it is a difficulty by no means confined to the sphere of Church life, or peculiar to theological casuistry. It confronts us at the family fireside, and demands how far a child is bound to honor his father and mother, by obeying his parents, and desires us to fix the definite boundary, beyond which a child is at full liberty to think and act for himself, and in defiance of parental rule;—to say distinctly at what age (if ever,) and under what circumstances, (if any) the son may rise up and say to his father, "I can no longer submit to your commands, release me from your authority, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me, that I may depart and henceforth be a law unto myself." It faces us in the forum, and asks us to define moral treason against existing civil power, to tell in unequivocal terms, how far the citizen is required to bow to the powers that be, and at what point he may refuse such obedience, resist the law (if ever,) and, ringing the tocsin of revolution, summon the oppressed to a violent vindication of their rights, and the riddance of their necks from the chafing chains of tyranny. Here indeed are nice questions to be settled, questions which are not to be disposed of in a passionate newspaper editorial hastily written, and which may puzzle the sagacity even of as profound thinkers as Dr. Nevin's antagonists.

Of this character now precisely is the difficulty of determining the proper limits of the Church authority, and private judgment. And how do the accusers of Mercersburg meet the difficulty? By respectfully acknowledging that ecclesiastical authority is a very good and useful thing, and that it is indispensably necessary to maintain it in some form, whilst at the same time, all power of any efficient exercise of such authority is wrested from the Church, and the fullest right is guaranteed

to the individual to do as he pleases, provided he only acts conscientiously. That is in a word, Church authority is rendered nugatory, and individual presumption, or private judgment enthroned. No quotations need be made to prove that this, substantially, is their solution of the troublesome problem. Their assumption of the defence of the prerogatives of private judgment in an age so notorious as the present for running into the wildest extremes upon this very point, as well as the ardor of their zeal in denouncing Dr. Nevin, for uttering some earnest words of warning against the growing evil, furnish the most satisfactory evidence of their views. It is therefore by a virtual nullification of "the power of the keys," that the difficulty is settled by this party. How does Popery meet and settle it? By wresting all right of personal thought and will from the individual, forcing from him a full surrender of his whole being, soul, body and estate, into her hands, assuming infallible authority, and exercising irresponsible power over him, not only for this world, but long after he has been launched into the next. That is, she forges "the keys" of Church power, into an iron sceptre of violent and arbitrary rule, with which she graciously subdues resistance to her overtures of peace, by striking the man down to the ground, and extending over him the protection of her heavy foot. And how does Dr. Nevin meet this solemn question? He has told us in his articles on Brownson's Quarterly, in terms so plain that no room is left for honest misapprehension, and with such a cogency of argument against the Romish doctrine on this subject, as to have defied all Mr. Brownson's skill at evasive refutation. This is Dr. Nevin's language:

"Unitarianism and Romanism are the contrary poles of Christianity, freedom and authority, the liberty of the individual subject and the binding force of the universal object, carried out each, by violent disjunction from each other, into nerveless pantomime and sham. Thus seemingly far apart, they are in reality always closely related; just as all extremes, by the force of their own falsehood, have an innate tendency to react, pendulum-wise, into the very opposites from which they seem to fly. Hence the familiar observation that Romanism in many cases leads to Rationalism and Infidelity. In bursting the bonds of mere blind authority, a Ronge has no power to stop in true Protestantism, but swings clear over into the dark void of full unbelief. So it is not unnatural, on the other hand, that Rationalism should lead the way occasionally, to popery

and superstition. This transition we see exemplified in the case of Mr. Brownson. . . . Having violently given himself away to a theory of the Church which puts an end to all private thinking in religion, he makes a merit apparently of the most violent consistency, in following it out to its most difficult consequences on all sides. The Christian salvation is for him a process that goes like clock-work. To his New England mind, the operation of the *machine* is all settled, as clearly as two and two make four, by the fixed nature of its pulleys and wheels. . . . Has it become thus a maxim of reason with him, to obey with unquestioning faith the Roman Church? He will be *rational* then in such style to the full end of the chapter. . . He will play the very *Yankee* himself in this new game; he will be a Puritan Romanist; making a king still of his own mind, and wilfully allowing his will to have no freedom whatever. . . . This is the natural extreme of Romanism. Against it the Reformation formed a legitimate and absolutely necessary reaction and protest. . . . It is as true now as it was at the beginning of the sixteenth century, that the *actualization* of truth in the world is something which can be accomplished only through the medium of intelligence and will on the part of the world itself; that liberty in its genuine sense is not simply the outward echo of authority, but the very element of its life, and the co-efficient of its power, in that which it brings to pass; that man is no passive machine merely in the business of his own salvation; *that the free activity of the individual subject in the world of mind, never can be paralyzed or overwhelmed by the sense of law, as a nature foreign and transcendent wholly to its own nature, without such bondage as involves in the end the overthrow of reason altogether.*" (Mercersburg Review, January, 1850, p. 33, 39, and as they sometimes add, though with less reason than in this case, *et passim*.)

This manifestly is not the Popish theory. Whatever else the opponents of Dr. N. may make out of such declarations, they must candidly concede that they betray no disposition to surrender human liberty to the tyrannical claims of Rome. And yet the German Reformed Church is held responsible, under heavy penalties, for retaining a Professor, who holds such opinions of private judgment, and even complimenting him with a unanimous vote of thanks for past services! She is asked to forget, that sentiments like the above, and much more of the same character than we dare venture to re-occupy these

pages with quoting, were ever published, and consider instead thereof only their caricature-paraphrase of a sentence published some seven years ago, as sufficient evidence to prove this count! But the Church would not do "any such foolish thing"! And sober, reflecting Protestantism will commend her wise and prudent judgment in the case, even though at present the disappointed antagonists of Dr. Nevin should cry out with vexation and chagrin: "We have a law, and by that law the man and the Church ought to be condemned."

The *third charge*, in this list of heresies tabled against Mercersburg, accuses Dr. Nevin of advocating views of the sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, which are denounced as unprotestant and pernicious. Upon this subject Dr. Nevin has written so fully and so freely, that it would be a work of supererogation to occupy a moment or a line, in presenting even only a condensed statement of his theory, but for the pertinacity and partial success with which his opponents have persisted in caricaturing or misrepresenting it. In their attempts at this, they seem to have had no small advantage in the fact already, that Mercersburg was so diligent in its investigation of this subject, and so earnest in its discussion. It was assumed to be suspicious at least, that the German Reformed Professor should think and write so much about what engaged so little attention among others. To be so zealous for the honor of an ordinance which afforded so little opportunity, in the administration of it, for the display of human ingenuity and power, stood in such strong contrast with the manworshipping mania of the age, as made those exhibiting such zeal appear to lean most dangerously in a wrong direction. Although but very few, therefore, of those who sympathized with the alarm-cry raised against the sacramentarianism of Mercersburg, pretended at all to examine or know for themselves what really were the views advanced by that school, it was taken as *prima facie* evidence against Dr. Nevin that he meddled at all with such an old bone of contention in the Christian Church, and revived the discussion of what others seemed to consider as long since settled to the full satisfaction of orthodox Protestantism. Taught in their early youth a system of religion which assigned to other services of the sanctuary an importance and efficiency which threw the sacraments comparatively into the shade, and accustomed by long habit to consider it an evidence of superstition, to attach any special virtue to such external forms of worship, it was to start

serious misgivings, as to the actual aim, and probable issue, of a discussion which clearly invested the subject with greater significance than it was supposed to possess. From this vantage ground now, the assailants of Dr. Nevin attacked him with an impetuosity of argument which threatened at once to overwhelm him, and unanswerably prove him a reprobate to the Protestant faith. He has been charged with maintaining the ubiquitarian heresy, the opus operatum abomination, and in a word with teaching Popish transubstantiation in the Protestant dialect. His theory is accused of ubiquitarianism, because he teaches the real spiritual presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Supper, and the participation of believing communicants in his glorified humanity. He is charged with advocating the opus operatum error, because he insists upon the presence of an inherent power in the sacraments, to convey the grace they are designed to symbolize and seal. And he is accused of holding views in general upon the subject, which must be popish in their prevailing spirit and bias, because they do not harmonize with his antagonists' theory of Protestantism. And assuredly the man proved guilty of so serious a departure from the old paths, is not fit to be continued in the post which Dr. Nevin has been permitted so long to occupy; and the Church, tolerating his wild vagaries, merits the severest censures of her more orthodox neighbors!

The better to see how Dr. Nevin does stand with reference to the genuine Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, it may be well simply to enumerate the four most prominent theories held upon the subject. *First*, we have the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation, avowing the total transmutation of the natural elements of the Supper into the natural flesh and blood of Christ, and the unconditionally saving efficacy of participation thereof under this form. *Then* we have Luther's characteristic modification of this old Romish fancy, in which he so vainly strives to shun the manifest absurdity of insisting upon a gross physical change which has yet evidently not taken place, by his peculiar scheme of consubstantiation, which allows the elements to remain in their natural form, but insists upon the actual presence of the natural body of Christ in the elements, and the real communication thereof to all that partake of the sacramental bread and wine, though only to believers in an efficacious manner. A *third* theory still holds to a presence of the Lord in the sacraments, in a form so real and so actual as to make it perfectly easy and

natural for its advocates to speak of believing communicants eating Christ's crucified body and drinking his shed blood, of their thus becoming more and more intimately incorporated with Christ, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, of the presence in the Holy Supper, of some real mysterious virtue, constituting it, by God's appointment, the channel of the communication of certain special grace, and investing it therefore with peculiar sacredness, and claims to extraordinary reverence as the concentration and symbolical embodiment of the most holy and consoling mysteries of the Gospel; and yet we find this theory guarding itself at the same time most cautiously against the errors involved in the two preceding schemes, denying any physical change in the elements, any concorporation with them of the body of Christ, and rejecting wholly the idea of their being any saving or sanctifying efficacy in the consecrated elements themselves. The *fourth* doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper is that which strips it entirely of all these enveloping mysticisms, and casts them away as the swaddling clothes, in which it was natural enough for puerile Protestantism to dress up its superstitious fancy concerning the sanctity of the Holy Eucharist, but which badly become the manly form to which the evangelical doctrine has grown in the space of three hundred years. Completely divested now of all the absurd and childish conceits, which it was naturally difficult for the early Reformers at once to prune off and cast away, we see in the Lord's Supper the severely simple commemorative meal described in the Gospel as instituted by our blessed Saviour. He is present indeed to believers in the Sacrament, but in a purely spiritual manner, just as he is always and everywhere present to his people's minds, when in their pious meditations they rise up to more intimate communion with him. He manifests himself to them there as he does not manifest himself to the world, but only by assisting their memories, by means of the figurative breaking of the bread, and figurative pouring out of the wine, to call vividly up before their mind's eye, as by the help of a suitable picture, all that Christ did and suffered on their behalf, and more intensely to meditate upon it. And in this way alone, by having pious feelings excited, and past events called vividly up to review, are communicants said to eat and drink the body and blood of Jesus, and enter into closer fellowship with his flesh and bones and life. The entire transaction is resolved into a purely rational operation, involving no mystery at all in its nature or observance, and possessing no special virtue.

This last now is said to be the true orthodox Christian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and for advocating another view of this holy sacrament, Dr. Nevin has been prosecuted and condemned as a vagarist and a heretic. But in order to make good this charge, his antagonists have not only to show that he advocates a theory diverse from theirs, but one that is in conflict with the old established doctrine of his Church upon this subject. The Professors at Mercersburg are not sworn to teach theology upon Dwight's system, or the Saybrook Platform, but according to the tenor and spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism. And they are pledged to maintain not Dr. Berg's paraphrase of the Heidelberg Catechism, or the Puritan Recorder's theory of Protestant doctrine and worship, but that interpretation which most truly harmonizes with that ancient standard's pervading genius and life. To see how far the Puritan conception of the Lord's Supper, as set forth even in its most favorable light in the preceding statement, varies from the doctrine of the German Reformed Church, nothing more is necessary than to set them alongside of each other. The Heidelberg Catechism teaches us that in the Holy Supper,—Christ “feeds and nourishes the soul (of the believing communicant) to everlasting life, *with his crucified body and shed blood*, as assuredly as he receives from the hand of the minister, and tastes with his mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the body and blood of Christ.” And to secure itself against a rationalistic resolution of all this into a merely commemorative appropriation of the atonement of Christ, the Catechism is very careful to tell us, that by “eating the crucified body, and drinking the shed blood of Christ,” it teaches *not merely* that we thus “embrace with a believing heart all the sufferings and death of Christ, and thereby obtain the pardon of sin and life eternal; *but also besides that, become more and more united to his sacred body by the Holy Ghost, who dwells both in Christ and in us; so that we, though Christ is in heaven and we on earth, are, notwithstanding ‘flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone; and that we live and are governed for ever by one spirit, as members of the same body are by one soul.’*” And there is something so pleasant to the spirit of the Catechism in this substantial way of speaking of Christ's presence in the Supper, so earnest is its zeal for this peculiar form of expression, that we find almost these same words reiterated in a subsequent answer, the Church seeming to fear lest the antecedent qualification might be construed with a

latitude which would vitiate the purity of its proper faith as previously avowed. "Why then doth Christ call the bread his body, and the cup his blood, or the new covenant in his blood; and Paul, "the communion of the body and blood of Christ?" "Christ speaks thus not without great reason, namely not only thereby to teach us, that *as bread and wine support this temporal life, so his crucified body and shed blood are the true meat and drink whereby our souls are fed to eternal life*; but more especially to assure us by these visible signs and pledges, that *we are as really partakers of his true body and blood (by the operation of the Holy Ghost) as we receive by the mouths of our bodies these holy signs in remembrance of him; and that all His sufferings are as certainly ours as if we had in our persons suffered and made satisfaction for our sins to God.*" (Heidelberg Catechism, Questions 75, 76, 78, 79.)

This is the doctrine of the German Reformed Church concerning the Holy Supper. This too is the doctrine of the Reformed Dutch Church's symbolical standards, the 35th Canon of Dort being scrupulously careful to bring most prominently into view those very peculiarities of the Heidelberg Catechism, which are so obnoxious to the opponents of Dr. Nevin. Mark its words: "Now as it is certain and beyond all doubt that Jesus Christ hath not enjoined to us the use of his sacraments in vain, so *he who works in us all what he represents to us by these holy signs*, though the manner surpasses our understanding and cannot be comprehended by us, as the operations of the Holy Ghost are hidden and incomprehensible. In the mean time we err not when we say, that *that which is eat and drunk by us is the proper and natural body, and the proper blood of Christ.* But the manner of our partaking of the same, is not by the mouth, but by the spirit through faith. Thus then, though Christ always sits at the right hand of his Father in the heavens, yet therefore doth he not cease to make us partakers of himself by faith. This feast is a spiritual table, at which Christ communicates himself with all his benefits to us, and gives us there to enjoy *both himself, and the merits of his sufferings and death*, nourishing, strengthening and comforting our poor comfortless souls, by the eating of his flesh, quickening and refreshing them by the drinking of his blood."

This we say was the doctrine of the Reformed Dutch Church two hundred and thirty years ago, and ought, consistently with its existing standards, to be the doctrine of its ministers

now. But that it is not, requires no more special proof than the cordial reception into its bosom of the man who with the Canons of Dort bound up with the Heidelberg Catechism in one hand, and the other uplifted in solemn appeal to heaven, could say, "If I believed that in that sacrament, I received the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, or that the glorified humanity, or that the Person of Christ was by some stupendous miracle communicated in the supper to the believer, I too should insist upon the intrinsic virtue of the sacraments, but as a German Reformed Protestant I am taught differently. I can find no such doctrine in the Bible. I can find nothing of the kind in the symbol of the Church's faith." Whether this inability to see the doctrine thus ceremoniously repudiated, arises from obtuseness or perversity of vision matters little for our purpose. It is quite enough to prove our charge of the Dutch Church's departure from its original faith, that it applauds so flat a renunciation of the very terms even of its catechism and confession, and espouses so cordially the cause of the author of it.

But if the Reformed Dutch Church has bartered its ancient creed upon this subject for the more rational and unmythical theory of New England Puritanism, it does not follow that the German Reformed Church must do so too. She prefers the old doctrine in its good old substantial sense, and is glad to have found the man in her midst, who was willing and able to defend her doctrine against the encroachments and mockeries of modern improvements. The German Reformed Church, continues, in the simplicity of her heart to believe, that sincere Christians, do, in the holy sacrament, receive the body of Christ, eat his flesh, and drink his blood, and that the sacrament possesses inherent power to unite them ever more and more closely to the Lord Jesus Christ, so that the same spirit which animates Him, may more and more animate them, just as one soul animates all the members of the same body. This would be hard doctrine for the Puritan Recorder to swallow; but this is not the only bone in the Heidelberg Catechism at which a New England Congregationalist of the New Haven school would choke. We however who are bred and born in the old Reformation family, have probably, a different physical organization, which makes such food our natural aliment, so that we find no inconvenience at all in using it. Accustomed to walk much more by faith than by sight, and implicitly to believe many things which we do not pretend to understand,

we find it much easier to humble our reason than turn recreant to our Church, when some "mystery of the kingdom" is to be received.

Now the issue between Dr. Nevin and his antagonists, and between those who sympathise with his antagonists and the German Reformed Church, is manifestly this: Shall the old Reformed doctrine concerning the sacraments be retained, or shall the modern Puritan theory be substituted in its stead. Dr. Nevin has labored indefatigably and nobly to resuscitate and defend the old view, or what he has clearly shown to be its full and fair equivalent. The Church in whose service he has toiled has witnessed his labor, weighed its results, and rejoices in finding itself so far restored again, to those old foundations from which the strong current of modern innovations had somewhat pushed it. And we think she does well to rejoice in it, and has no reason to deplore her present trials, so long as her opponents can prove nothing worse against her or her Professors, than that they have shown themselves more consistent and firm in the maintenance of their evangelical integrity, and their resolute adherence to their ancient standards, than those who arrogate to themselves a higher and more intelligent standard of orthodoxy.

Altogether the hostility evinced by the opponents of Dr. Nevin, against the old sacramental doctrine of the Reformed Church, as reviewed and defended in his *unanswered*, and we presume unanswerable, tract upon this subject, furnishes occasion for serious alarm, and sincere regret. There is, to be sure, something unpleasantly and painfully ominous in the ardor with which they espouse the disorganizing and sect-engendering tenets of ultra independency, and in their cordial animosity against the churchly conservatism, or constitutionalism, for which Mercersburg has been contending so courageously for the last ten years. It augurs any thing but good for the great Protestant interest of this country, that those desiring to be regarded, and most commonly accredited, as its most intelligent and valiant champions, should seem thus to make common cause with the authority-despising *freigeisterei* of the age, and virtually sanction its impatience of ecclesiastical restraint, by rearing its radical error into one of the proudest pillars of Protestantism. But allowance must be made for the blind and mistaken zeal exhibited upon this point, in view of the agitations and convulsions of the times; especially, considering, as has been seen, how happily their practice contra-

dicts, and so disproves their argument. For their abandonment however of the old Reformed doctrine concerning the deep mysterious import and efficacy of the holy sacraments, and most emphatically that of the Lord's Supper, no such consoling palliative presents itself. Indeed the *form* of their opposition to it, involving not merely a renunciation, but a denunciation of it, and furthermore a solemn condemnation, by their crimination of Dr. Nevin and the German Reformed Church, of the most renowned and venerated among the old Reformers, (Zwingli, Melancthon, Calvin) who have been incontrovertibly proved to have held the very doctrine for which we have contended, this betrays a radical departure from the ancient landmarks, and a repudiation of time-honored dogmas,—a disposition and readiness to barter the most sacred verities of the past, for the more popular conceits of our more rational era—which cannot fail to awaken in every thoughtful heart, the most distressing anxieties for the future. It may serve the present purpose of these antagonists of Mercersburg, to render Dr. Nevin's views odious by charging them with being identical with the grosser fancies of the Popish doctrine. But to prefer a charge, and to prove it are different things. Dr. Nevin has nowhere taught such a presence of our Lord in the sacraments as involves the *ubiquity* of Christ's body. His positive and unqualified denial of this charge, would have satisfied more generous antagonists than he has had the fortune for the most part of meeting with, that they had wrongfully accused him in this respect, especially as his language could hardly be made to bear the sense they put upon it, even by the most forced construction. If they cannot make the distinction which he most clearly makes, between humanity and corporiety, between the grosser flesh and blood, bones and sinews, muscles and limbs of the human body, and the human nature they outwardly invest, why that is no fault of his. The doctrine of the Catechism he was bound to go by in his instructions, manifestly implies and calls for such a distinction, and so he was fully justified in making and maintaining it. And so again in reference to the *efficacy* of the sacraments as means of grace. In order to make their accusation the more plausible and popular, the adversaries of Mercersburg have charged Dr. Nevin with advocating a sentiment synonymous with the pernicious error of the Romish Church upon this point, although he has repeatedly repudiated the calumny (for such it really became upon their reiteration of it in the face of his solemn

denial) and shown wherein they misapprehended his language and distorted his view. If his opponents are unable to see any difference between the opus operatum efficacy maintained by Rome, and that adaptedness of the sacraments to be the actual seals of the grace they so appropriately signify, and therefore to be possessed of divine efficiency as media for the actual conveyance of the grace they offer, which our standards most unequivocally teach, assuredly he and the Church are not to be ostracised for that. The difference is not annulled by their inability to discern it, neither is Dr. Nevin's duty to teach and defend it, or the Church's right to sustain him in so doing, thereby annulled. Indeed it is a fortunate circumstance for the old Reformed faith, that there are yet left those who can see what others slur or slight.

Instead therefore of frightening the German Reformed Church from her proper and natural position in reference to these subjects, the strong disposition betrayed by those, whose more orthodox pretensions justified the hope of better things from them, to fritter away the ancient faith of our fathers until its beauty is marred, and its strength destroyed, has only convinced her of the necessity of adhering to that fire and storm-proof faith with the more unflinching fidelity. Whatever else the adversaries of Mercersburg have failed to prove to her mind, they have most fully satisfied her of this. Incidental evidences of a growing tendency on the part of Corresponding Denominations to fall in with the current anti-sacramentarianism of New England theology, had indeed not been wanting previously. But not until recently had any of the Churches claiming blood-affinity with the old Reformed Theology, of the sixteenth century, given its formal sanction to this mournful defection. It was time therefore for the legitimate representative of the oldest daughter of the Reformation in this country, to fix her foot more firmly upon her ancient foundations, and declare her determination not to be moved from thence. Those she knew were compactly built and of solid material. The hemlock of these modern "*platforms*," and the slim slabs by which they appeared to be propped, seemed insecure to those accustomed to rest on rocks. Even "*Plymouth Rock*" seemed not as fair and firm in her eyes, (had not the security of which ages of trial gave assurance,) as the "*Rock of Ages*" on which her fathers built, and taught her implicitly to trust. To this therefore she has resolved to cling. And the more violently the storm of opposition strives to beat her off from her refuge,

the more closely does she cling to it, and prove to those who may choose to observe her struggle, that though her form be slender, and her hand be small, she still has a heroic heart, and a believing grasp!

It may indeed grieve her to find herself the object of unkind suspicions among those whose friendship she desires to merit and enjoy. We do not think that she can be charged with contempt for the confidence and good will of sister Churches. But it is surely better, if it must be, to forego the present favor of misjudging friends, than to forfeit her faith. Conscious of integrity, and convinced that she is falsely accused, and unrighteously suspected, she seems to think it best to bide her time, endure her present wrongs, and patiently await the acquitting vindication of the future. And we are fully confident, that she will then find, in a retrospective view of the unappreciated service she is now, according to her humble means, seeking to render the cause of genuine Protestantism, an abundant recompense for all the reproaches now endured.

Reserving the consideration of the other points involved in this controversy for the next issue of the Review, we herewith close for the present.

J. H. A. B.

ART. VI.—GERMAN THEOLOGY AND THE CHURCH QUESTION.*

[Translated from "*Schaff's Kirchenfreund*," for September, 1852.]

IF we compare the present theological literature of English and American Protestantism, with that of the modern Evangelical school of Germany, we meet with a remarkable difference in their conception of *Catholicism*. Of this we have already had occasion to speak, more fully, in our review of Dr. Ullmann's "*Reformers before the Reformation*," which rests throughout on the assumption that Protestantism can be properly understood and defended only as the legitimate and necessary product of mediæval Catholicism, and not as an abrupt unhistorical revolution. To unchurch the Catholic Church, to cut her off entirely from the kingdom of God, and

* This essay is the conclusion of a series of articles on the most distinguished cotemporary University-theologians of Germany, which appeared in the May, July, August and September numbers of the *Kirchenfreund*, for 1852.

to identify her with the kingdom of Antichrist, as was almost unanimously done by the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church, during its sessions at Cincinnati, 1845, and which that Church, notwithstanding the well-founded protest of her able and learned Professors at Princeton, has not yet rescinded,) would, upon German ground, be absolutely impossible. The Evangelical Theology of Germany is indeed also thoroughly Protestant in principle and spirit, and rests upon that freedom of thought, and impartiality of investigation, which we properly owe to the Reformation. But this very freedom and impartiality of research has also lead her to conceive and judge of the Catholic Church in a manner totally different from the old Protestant polemics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This, however, does by no means necessarily involve an approach towards Rome, but indicates rather a new and advanced position of Protestantism itself, which we understand to be the progressive principle of modern church history, whilst Romanizing tendencies are retrograde movements and deadly hostile to a proper conception of progressive development, which underlies all living German theology of the present day, especially its best works on church history.

First of all, the modern investigation of ecclesiastical and profane historians have entirely overthrown the earlier views concerning the *Middle Ages*. It may now be received as an established fact, admitted by all learned judges, that the Roman Catholic Church as such, during that age, was, by no means, the great Apostacy or kingdom of Antichrist, but the bearer of true Christianity, with its sacred canon and saving ordinances, the mother of the Romanic and Germanic nations, and of the whole modern European civilization, and notwithstanding her adherent corruption, carried within herself a vast amount of elevated piety and heroic virtue. The Papacy itself is regarded now, by the most distinguished modern church historians, and even by profane historians, such as John von Müller, Leo, Ranke, and Macaulay, as an institution absolutely indispensable for that time, and upon the whole highly beneficial, for the education of the Germanic nations, for the preservation of the unity, and security of the freedom and independence of the Church, over against the encroachments of the secular power. As the law of Moses was a schoolmaster to Christ, so the new Christian legalism of mediæval Catholicism prepared the way for Evangelical Protestantism. "Whatever opinion

we may hold," says the Protestant historian *Ranke*,* "concerning the Popes of former times, they had ever important interests in view—the fostering of an oppressed religion, the contention with Heathenism, the spread of Christianity throughout the Northern nations, and the establishment of an independent hierarchical power; it belongs to the dignity of human nature to will and to accomplish something great: these movements the Popes kept alive, and gave them a higher direction." To what extent similar conceptions have gradually taken root, of late, in English Protestant literature, notwithstanding the opposition of religious prejudices, the highly gifted *Macaulay* bears testimony, who leaves it undecided whether England is not more indebted for her greatness to Catholicism than to Protestantism, and thus frankly speaks concerning the Papacy of the Middle Ages: †

"Even the spiritual supremacy arrogated by the Pope was, in the dark ages, productive of far more good than evil. Its effect was to unite the nations of Western Europe in one great commonwealth. What the Olympian chariot course, and the Pythian oracle were to all the Greek cities, from Trebizond to Marseilles, Rome and her bishop were to all the Christians of the Latin communion, from Calabria to the Hebrides. Thus grew up sentiments of enlarged benevolence. Races separated from each other by seas and mountains acknowledged a fraternal tie, and a common code of public law. Even in war, the cruelty of the conqueror was not seldom mitigated by a recollection that he and his vanquished enemies were all members of one great federation."

The proper coryphei of the Papacy, such as Nicholas, Hildebrand, and Innocent III., heretofore regarded as scarcely anything better than incarnate devils, are now looked upon as heroes and benefactors of humanity. Even *Neander*, who is well known to have naturally a great antipathy to every thing priestly and hierarchical, and who zealously endeavors to place the opposers of the ruling Church in the most advantageous light possible, candidly expresses his profound admiration for the moral character and great merits of these popes. In the same manner has the judgment concerning the other prominent phenomena of the Middle Ages—the crusades, the monastic orders and their founders, religious art, scholasticism

* *Roman Popes in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1 part, p. 44 second edition.

† *History of England*, ch. 1.

and mysticism—assumed a more favorable form, in proportion as they are brought from the dust of the past to light, and understood in their organic connection with the nature and wants of that period. It is impossible, e. g., to read with attention, Neander's Bernard, or Hasse's Anselm, without being filled with profound admiration for the spirit, virtue and piety of these men, although they move throughout in the spirit and mould of the Catholic Church, and belong, as is well known, to her most distinguished teachers and saints.

But this altered conception of the Middle Ages involves an enormous concession to Catholicism, and a fatal blow against a bigoted ultra-Protestantism. A Church, which throughout this whole transition period, from ancient to modern times, sent out such a host of self-denying missionaries to heathen nations, who carried the Gospel to the Germans, Scandinavians, Anglo-Saxons, Picts and Scots, and Slavonians—a Church, which had power to excite all Europe to a heroic conflict against the false prophet for the recovery of the holy sepulchre of the Redeemer—a Church, which contended vigorously and successfully against the despotism of worldly potentates, slavery, barbarity, and a thousand other evils of society, which gave wholesome laws to the states, raised the female sex to its present dignity, which interested herself in behalf of the poor and suffering of all classes, which established asylums for misery, and institutions of benevolence in all places, which erected unto the Lord numberless churches, chapels, and those Gothic cathedrals, which even yet command the admiration of the world, which gave the first impulse to a general education of the people, which founded and sheltered almost all those European universities, which even to this day exert an immeasurable influence—a Church which has produced within her bosom such an incalculable number of profound minds, elevated characters and devoted saints:—such a Church cannot possibly, in the nature of the case, be the Antichrist and synagogue of Satan, notwithstanding the many anti-Christian elements which she may have included within her bosom, and of which no age and no denomination is entirely free. That extreme representation, which the majority of our popular religious papers continue to repeat from week to week, cannot for one moment maintain itself against the results of later Protestant historical research, and must therefore in due time disappear from the consciousness of all educated and unprejudiced minds.

Moreover, not only the Middle Ages, but also the *first six centuries* of the Christian Church, have been thoroughly re-examined, and documents have been brought to light, which for the most part were unknown even by name, at the time of the Reformation, when historical study, and the publication of ancient works had scarcely begun. Even Luther once calls Tertullian, who lived as late as the end of the second, and beginning of the third centuries, "the *oldest* teacher which we have since the time of the Apostles," (Works, ed. Walch XX, 1063), so that for him, the line of the Apostolical Fathers, and the numerous Apologists of the second century did not exist, with the exception of uncertain fragments which he could not but know from the legends of the martyr Ignatius, Polycarp and Clemens, "for whom," as he once remarks, "a bad boy forged books." The Reformers were best acquainted with Augustine, and their reverence and love for this profoundly pious as well as spirited and highly gifted father, was of immeasurable importance for their theological and moral training and position, as otherwise the Reformation would most probably have assumed a far more radical character. Through the indefatigable diligence and zealous inquiry of modern times, and through the impulse, which more especially Neander has given to historical Monography, we have at present, in the German language, thorough and complete works on Leo, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzen, Basil, Athanasius, Origen, Cyprian, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, and even back to the immediate successors of the Apostles; so that the Nicene and Ante-Nicene Christianity, with the corresponding heresies of Arianism, Gnosticism and Ebionism, &c., are as clearly presented to our view, or at least as accessible as the Christianity of the seventeenth century. If we now read impartially those valuable monographies, or similar and more comprehensive works, such as Rothe's *Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*, Dorner's *Geschichte der Christologie*, Möhler's *Patrologie*, &c., and if we, in connection with these, candidly study only some of the more important productions of patristic theology, such as Chrysostom on the Priesthood, Augustine's *Confessions*, Cyprian on the Unity of the Church, Tertullian on the Prescription of Heretics, Irenaeus against the Gnostics, and the Epistles of Ignatius, we must inevitably receive the impression that the Church of antiquity was in its predominant spirit and tendency, far more Catholic than Protestant, and that the Middle Ages are only a natural continuation

of the Nicene Christianity. Could Ambrosius, Athanasius, Cyprian, Irenæus, Ignatius, Clemens and Polycarp suddenly arise from their graves, and be transferred to Puritan New England, they would scarcely there recognize the Christianity of those venerable Martyrs and Confessors, for which they lived and suffered; but, on the contrary, would much sooner discover, not only amongst the Universalists and Unitarians, but amongst the Baptists and Puritans themselves, distinct traces of a congeniality of spirit with the heretics and schismatics of their own days. We state this, however, without any disrespect whatever, but simply as the impression received from an impartial comparison of historical facts. The most striking difference between the Primitive Church and Protestantism, lies in the doctrine of the Rule of Faith, of the Relation of the Scriptures to Tradition, of the Church, her Unity, her Catholicity, her Exclusiveness, and of the Sacraments. Even of the material principle of Protestantism, the doctrine of Justification by Faith *alone*, in *Luther's* sense, the Fathers know nothing, not even Augustine;* and instead of making this the article of the standing and falling Church, they assign rather to the Christology, to the mystery of the Incarnation and to the Holy Trinity, the central position in the Christian system, and the confession or denial of Christ's real humanity, is with them, according to 1 John, 4, the sure criterion of orthodoxy or heterodoxy.† In all these points of

* *Neander*, for instance, clearly shows, that Augustine's conception of justification is not a forensic outward imputation, (however important this may be) but a really making just, and hence substantially the same with sanctification. This by no means interferes necessarily with the doctrine of free grace, of which the same father is well known to have been one of the most zealous defenders. We may indeed say, that the substance of the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith properly understood is salvation by free grace, and in this general form it underlies no doubt the piety of all ages and of all true Christians.

† We cannot refrain from citing here a remarkable confession of Dr. W. J. *Tiersack*, in his valuable work on the New Testament Canon, (1845, p. 280) as it serves to illustrate, in a most impartial manner, the impression of this contrast between Patristic and Protestant Theology, even in its most churchly and orthodox form:—"What a strange impression do the Church Fathers, for the most part, make upon him who, filled with a strictly Protestant consciousness, betakes himself for the first time to their study. Thus it happened with the author of these discussions. Nourished by the best devotional works of the older Protestant writers, and educated theologically in the Dogmatics and Exegesis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he turned to the Church Fathers. He remembers well how strange it appeared to him from the beginning, in not being able to find here anything of those truths which formed the well-springs of his entire religious life; nothing of that

doctrine, as well as in the hierarchical constitution, the sacrificial worship, and the ascetic conception of Christian virtue and piety, we clearly discover, in the Church Fathers, from Gregory and Leo up to Cyprian, Irenæus and Ignatius, at least the germs of that system, which afterwards completed itself in the Roman Catholic Church. This is continually becoming acknowledged the more in proportion as researches are extended in this sphere, and their results produced in a popular form. Without this resemblance, it would be absolutely impossible to account for the fact, that the Roman Catholic Church

[Protestant] way, which the sinner must tread in order to obtain peace, and become assured of divine grace; nothing of the merit of Christ as the only ground of pardon [?], nothing of an unceasing repentance, and continually fresh drawings from the fountain of free grace, and nothing of that lofty assurance of a justified Christian. Instead of this, he found that all stress was laid upon the Incarnation of the Divine Logos, upon a correct knowledge of this sublime object of worship, upon the objective mystery of the Trinity and Incarnation, upon the connection of creation, redemption and the future restoration of the creature in the glorification even of the human corporeality, upon the freedom of man, and upon the reality of the divine workings of grace in the Sacraments. Yet it was not too much for him to live himself into this whole method of thought, and, without giving up anything that is true and inalienable in the Protestant, especially the Lutheran Protestant consciousness, to conquer its oneness by means of a living appropriation of the theology of the Fathers. He soon learned that the Christian Church, over against the errors of the present, the Pantheism and Fatalism, the Spiritualism, and misapprehension of the significance of corporeality, stood in need of a decided re-assumption of the truths preserved in the Patristic Theology, and of an assimilation of her entire existence to the peculiar character of the ancient Church, at least internally, since the Reformation of external circumstances lies not within the reach of human power. The Primitive Christian Church appeared to him more and more in her full splendor and exalted beauty, of which only fragmentary lineaments are to be recognized in the churches, confessions and sects of the present. But the knowledge of this truly Apostolic-Catholic Church, which is neither identical with the Greek nor the Roman Church—but which differs still *far more* from Protestantism—this it is which gradually emancipated him from all polemical and denominational fanaticism, and afforded him the happiness of a disposition as decided and uncompromising against that which is unchristian and antichristian, as irenical and liberal towards that which is true and Christian in the manifold confessions of the present.”—Those who wish to convince themselves that the views of the Fathers from Ignatius down to Augustine on the nature of the Church, which in some respects is the most important and comprehensive point of difference between Romanism and Protestantism, are essentially Catholic, and that the article of the creed, *Credo unam sanctam apostolicam ecclesiam*, with them, did not refer to an invisible abstraction, but to a visible historical reality, are respectfully referred to the third book in Dr. Rothe's masterly work on the early Church. The articles of Dr. Nevin on Early Christianity, and on Cyprian too, with which the readers of the *Mercersburg Review* are familiar, are quite to the point, and bring out a great many facts in clear and strong light which are worthy of the most serious attention, and cannot be put aside by mere categorical protests or ungentlemanly insinuations.

has canonized the most distinguished and pious of the fathers and cherishes their memory with filial veneration and gratitude to this day. It is only through want of knowledge, or a singular delusion, that any section of Protestantism could ever imagine itself to be a simple restoration of the Nicene or ante-Nicene age.

If however we concede this much, from a mere historical standpoint, it is easy to see what an enormous influence such an admission must have upon the final solution of the *Church Question*. For whoever despises the judgment of History, robs himself at the same time of all foundation and basis. If the fifteen centuries prior to the Reformation are deserving of no confidence, neither are the last three centuries entitled to any respect. "If any one neglect to hear the voice of the Church," saith our Lord, "let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." (Matt. 18: 17). In proportion as we undermine and reject the testimony of Church History, in theological and religious questions, do we also open the door to skepticism and nihilism. Herein precisely lies the great ecclesiastical and religious importance of modern church-historical research, even if this should not yet be duly acknowledged by many German theologians. The time will and must come, when the practical conclusions will be drawn from the theory.

But some will at once ask, Of what concern is the testimony of history to me, if I have the *Word of God* in my favor, which is, after all, the only certain Rule of Faith and Life; whilst the greatest schoolmen and Church Fathers, according to their own confession, were themselves sinful men, and liable to err? Very true! But who has made you an infallible *interpreter* of this Word? Has not this Word already existed in the Church before the sixteenth century, and as such been highly honored, read, transcribed, translated and commented upon? Whence then have you the canon, save directly from the faithful collection and transmission of the Catholic Church? Who furnishes you the proof of the genuineness and integrity of the apostolical writings, except the testimonies of the ancient ecclesiastical authors? If already the immediate disciples of the Apostles, if Ignatius, Clemens and Polycarp, if the fathers and martyrs of the second and third centuries, have radically misunderstood the New Testament, what guaranty have we then that *you*, in the nineteenth century, understand it properly throughout, wherever you may differ from them? Are you then made of better stuff than the Confessors and Martyrs

of the blooming period of the Church? Have you done and suffered more for Christ? You say: The clear letter of Paul and John condemns the Catholic Church as Antichrist, as the Man of Sin, the Beast from the abyss, as the Babylon destined to be destroyed. But whence do you know that this interpretation is correct? Since you totally reject the infallibility of the Pope, and perhaps also of the Church in general, you will certainly not be so inconsistent, and ridiculously presumptuous, as to claim it for yourself or any other Protestant interpreter? Moreover, such an application of the passages in question was wholly unheard of until within the later period of the Middle Ages, when it was invented by certain fanatical sects, to suit their polemical ends. The Church Fathers, without exception, even Irenæus, who through Polycarp stood in close relation to the Apostle John himself, have referred them to Gnosticism and to the World-Empire of *heathen* Rome. At all events, the Reformers could not have used consistently the Revelation of John for any polemical purpose, since Luther and Zwingli denied its Apostolical origin, and Calvin, with all his masterly skill as a commentator, wisely suffered it to remain unexplained. Later Protestant interpreters, such as Hammond and Grotius, and all modern expounders of Scripture, (quite lately the orthodox Hengstenberg, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, and even the Puritan Stuart,) have, almost without exception, rejected the Anti-Roman interpretation, as entirely untenable, and again returned to the explanation of the Church Fathers.*

However this may be, there are, at all events, many more *clear and distinct* passages in Scripture, which, according to the unanimous explanation of Catholic and Protestant commentators, promise to the Church of Christ an *indestructible continuation and an uninterrupted presence of her divine Head, even to the end of the world*. Of this there cannot be the least doubt, and therefore must we above all, build our theory of Church History upon *such* declarations, and not upon a very doubtful interpretation of the darkest passages in the most mysterious book of the Bible—which, not without reason, stands last in our canon. But if it should appear as the result of the modern thorough and impartial investigations

* We must remark, however, that the *exclusive* reference of the 13th and 17th chapters of the Apocalypse does not seem to do justice to the inspired vision of John, which seems to include several successive world-powers opposed to the kingdom of Christ. Still less can we adopt Hengstenberg's view of the Millennium.

of the greatest Protestant Historians, that the Christian Church, before the Reformation, even back to the days of the Apostolic Fathers, was not in her predominant spirit and character Protestant, but essentially Catholic, in most of those points where the two systems are at war with each other, and that the protesting sects, from the Ebionites and Gnostics, down to the Cathari and Albigenses present a confused mixture of contradictory opinions, and as such cannot possibly constitute the uninterrupted continuation of the Life of Christ and evangelical truth: it necessarily follows that such a defense of Protestantism, which rests upon an entire rejection of Catholicism,—as a system of falsehood,—be it Baptistie, Puritanic, Presbyterian or Anglican—stands in direct contradiction to the testimony of history and those unequivocal sayings of Christ and his Apostles, and must therefore be abandoned.

This is the deciding point, to which the controversy between Protestantism and Catholicism, which has lately arisen with renewed zeal and energy in Germany, England and the United States, is forced, and should some German theologians, who have aided in bringing about this issue, in their predominantly theoretical tendency and scientific self-complacency, concern themselves little about the practical consequences, there are many divines in practical England and America, who will draw the final conclusions. Examples might readily be pointed out, which in reality confirm this. It is a remarkable and interesting fact, that German evangelical theology, becomes far more practical and serious in its consequences, upon English ground, than in Germany itself. For the Englishman seldom contents himself with naked theories and speculations, but endeavors directly to bring them into practical life, to organize them externally and realize them in some concrete form. This can easily be seen in Methodism, compared with the congenial, but unorganized Pietism. Puseyism exhibits the same tendency, though in an opposite direction; for in it, the idea of the Church has long since emerged from the sphere of theological research, and has become a solemn practical life-question, which has already driven a considerable number of the Clergy and Laity, from the Protestant into the Roman camp. Neither would it greatly surprise us, should we live to see also in America, a larger secession of educated men towards Rome, arising partly at least from an earnest but one-sided study of Church history. For here such a step could be more easily accounted

for, than in Germany, as a necessary reaction against extreme forms of anti-catholic theology. To do this, we need only consider that the Protestant Press of America, with few honorable exceptions, from the city papers, with their ten and twenty thousand subscribers, down to the most obscure country sheets, rests upon this totally anti-scriptural and anti-historical theory; that it contends against the Roman Church with weapons of the blindest fanaticism, and that it suffers itself to make use of such rude and uncharitable misrepresentations, which we should be obliged to stigmatize directly as barefaced lies, could they not be accounted for, on the ground of ignorance and prejudice, and did not the otherwise religious character of these Intelligencers and non-Intelligencers, compel us to adopt the latter expedient. He who has ever thoroughly and impartially studied the history of the Church before the Reformation and the classical productions of Roman Divines, such as Bellarmine, Bossuet, Möhler, Wiseman, Ballmes and Newman, must possess a more than ordinary amount of patience and stoical tranquility of mind, if he can behold those caricatures which are circulated from week to week, without being filled with indignation against the conscious or unconscious calumniators, and with an increasing sympathy for the slandered party. Add to this, the growing confusion in Protestantism, which notwithstanding its great advantages in many other respects is, precisely in this country, more than in any other, split into numberless denominations and sects, without any human prospect for a consolidation or union, and presents a confused mixture of private opinions and subjective, ever changing notions, which threaten finally to wash away all the solid ground of real supernatural faith and fixed doctrine from under our feet, unless important conservative powers should stay the wild stream. The most trifling cause is considered sufficient to mangle the Body of Christ, and to transgress the Apostle's command: "Forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." And along with this, there is such an abuse made of the Word of God, that it must furnish proof texts for the wildest dreams, as if it were a nose of wax and a book of all sorts of contradictions. If then we have any idea of the Church, its inherent unity and catholicity, of law and authority, and regard Christianity as a supernatural power, to which we must humbly submit, instead of fashioning it according to a rationalistic common sense, and the conceptions of modern times, until it

is finally sunk to the sphere of Nature, and becomes the product of our reason and imagination; we must have an unusually strong confidence in History, and continually look to the past, and with hope to the future, so as not to become disheartened sometimes by the present Babel of Protestant sects. Without such a confidence in God—who, as a Portuguese proverb says, writes also on a crooked line, and can call a beautiful creation out of chaos; without the virtue of patient expectation and hope, there is a strong inducement for serious minds, which have become fully conscious of the weight and difficulties of this subject, to cast themselves into the arms of Roman uniformity, if only for the purpose of escaping this eternal fluctuation, and experimenting to acquire a firm foundation and basis, and to enjoy as they hope at least, the feeling of comfortable rest and security.

If therefore Protestantism is to be defended, without surrendering the thoroughly scriptural idea of an indestructible Church, and an uninterrupted indwelling presence of Christ, and without doing violence to the clear testimony of History, prior to the Reformation, it can only be done by conceding, at the same time, a relative title to Catholicism, and allowing it to have been the chief, if not the only bearer of Christianity, down to the sixteenth century, and that it even yet constitutes a vital member of the Body of Christ. Dr. *Rothe* says in his learned and not sufficiently appreciated work, entitled *Die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*, (Preface, p. ix.): “There can be no more powerful apology for Protestantism, than the acknowledgment, yea even the positive affirmation of the fact, that in the *past*, Catholicism, according to its substance, has had full historical reality and necessity, deep inward truth, and high moral excellence and power.” So we say also: The noblest and most efficient way of defending Protestantism, is not to run down and abuse, but rather to glorify and defend Catholicism, as the bearer of mediæval Christianity, and as a necessary preparation for Protestantism itself, without which the latter could as little have made its appearance, as Christianity without Judaism, or as liberty without the school of authority and obedience. In the same way we may say, that the honor of the New Testament is not diminished, but increased rather and properly guarded, by giving the Old Testament all due credit and importance as a preparatory dispensation of the gospel.

But even this alone is not sufficient. For a Church, which,

in spite of the tremendous shock experienced in the sixteenth century, depriving her of the most vigorous nations, has yet power to revive herself, and replace, at least to a great extent, the lost territory by means of important conquests in the heathen world; which has since been able to reproduce in the sphere of theology, a Bellarmine, a Baronio, a Peteau, a Bossuet, a Möhler,—in the sphere of missions and Christian Life, a Xavier, a Borromeo, a Filippo of Neri, a Vincens of Paula, a Paschal, a Fenelon, a Sailer; which in later times has attracted talented men so differently constituted, such as Haller, Stolberg, Novalis, Schlegel, Hurter, Florencourt, Newman, Manning, Wilberforce and Brownson; which subsequent to the Revolutionary storm of 1848, has elevated herself with renewed energy, extended her arms towards the North and West, into the very heart of Protestant civilization, and the bulwark of Protestant power, and wherever she goes, throws the Government, Clergy and Laity into a feverish agitation, and sets a thousand tongues and pens in motion against her:—such a Church cannot have her significance in the past *alone*, but must possess even yet an important life-power, a relative necessity for the present, and a significant mission for the future. This is, of course, at once to confess that Protestantism does not describe the entire circumference of the Church, even since the time of the Reformation,—although it is evidently the chief bearer of modern civilization,—but that it is in its own nature, onesided, that it suffers from imperfections, as well as its adversary, although of an opposite character, that it, on this account, again stands in need of a Reformation, that it has, in Catholicism its necessary complement, and that it can never complete itself without it. The signs of the times

* There is only too much truth in the following remarks of the distinguished Anglican convert, Dr. *Newman*, in the preface to his lectures to Anglicans: "There is an instinctive feeling of curiosity, interest, anxiety, and awe, mingled together in various proportions, according to the tempers and opinions of individuals, when the Catholic Church makes her appearance in any neighborhood, rich or poor, in the person of her missionary or her religious communities. Do what they will, denounce her as they may, her enemies cannot quench this emotion in the breasts of others, or in their own. It is their involuntary homage to the Notes of the Church; it is their spontaneous recognition of her royal descent and her imperial claim: it is a specific feeling, which no other religion tends to excite. Judaism, Mahometanism, Anglicanism, Methodism, old religions and young, romantic and common-place, have not the spell. The presence of the Church creates a discomposure and restlessness, or a thrill of exultation, wherever she comes. Meetings are held, denunciations launched, calumnies spread abroad, and hearts beat secretly the while."

also, point clearly enough to this issue. Protestantism is just at this time undergoing a thorough examination and sifting in Germany, England and North America, and it is to be hoped that the sermon of repentance, which is thus delivered unto it, may not be overheard, but that it may reap similar benefits from the progress of its old hereditary enemy, whilst the Roman Church has evidently gained to a great extent, in activity and zeal, by means of the reacting and arousing influence of Protestantism. For wherever they have come into contact, it can easily be seen, that Romanism is in a far more living and hopeful condition, than where it sways the sceptre of undisturbed dominion, e. g., in the spiritually dead Mexico, Brazil, Portugal and Croatia.

This liberal position towards Rome is, at all events, more generous, far more consistent with the spirit of Christian charity, and much better calculated to gain over the adversary, than that harsh and repulsive fanaticism, which hesitates not even to make common cause with Rationalists, Pantheists, Atheists, Socialists and impure Revolutionary spirits of every possible character, over against Catholicism, as is too frequently the case with many of our religious sheets. Only think of the many Protestant patrons, such miserable apostates and unprincipled slanderers as Maria Monk, Ronge, Leahy, (who lately turned out a murderer!) Achilli, etc., have found in our midst! "What communion hath Christ with Belial, or light with darkness?" But the main point here is, that this mild and moderate polemic is more in keeping with *truth*, the Word of God, and the testimony of History, than the other, which rests purely on historical suppositions, caricatures and perversions.

But now it may be asked, How can one remain a Protestant any longer, with a good conscience, if he makes such significant concessions to the Catholic Church, regarding her as the only true Church down to the Reformation, and attributing to her even to this day such an important position and mission? Is not that which was once the true Church, always the true Church? How can Christianity be first Catholic, then Protestant, without contradicting itself? Of course, from the standpoint of a mechanical conception of Christianity and History, this difficulty is not easily solved. Just as soon as we conceive of ecclesiastical Christianity as a system, pre-concluded from the start, and completed in its outward form, for all time, so soon must we consistently become either Roman Catholic or Ultra-Protestant. There is no middle ground. But far otherwise is it from the standpoint of *historical devel-*

opment, which underlies all the more important German historical works of modern times, although the thing itself is as old as history, and has a firm foundation in the Bible. The only merit which German theology can claim in this respect is, that it has brought out the idea in a scientific form and applied it to the treatment of history. This conception, it seems to us, affords the only tenable foundation upon which to justify the Reformation and Protestantism, without doing violence to preceding history, and destroying the nature of an uninterrupted Church. Hence its vast practical importance for the solution of the Church question. We speak here, of course, only of the *theological* and *scientific* defense of Protestantism. For the plain practical Christian is not and ought not to be troubled with these historical difficulties; he bases his faith in Protestantism very properly on the Word of God, as he understands it, on his own religious experience, and on the practical fruits of the system which he finds to compare very favorably on the whole with those of the opposite system. But the theologian must battle with the solemn problem of the Church question, as it stares him in the face from the pages of history. To him, it cannot possibly be indifferent what Christianity has been in the different ages of the world, and what relation his own view of it sustains to the great and good men of bygone days who have suffered all for Christ.

Development is properly identical with history itself; for history is life, and all life involves growth, evolution and progress. Our bodily existence, all our mental faculties, the Christian life, and the sanctification of every individual, constitute such a process of development from the lower to the higher. Why should not the same law hold, when applied to the whole, the communion which is made up of individuals? Any reasonable person will allow a progress in trade, business, in politics, arts, science and civilization; why not also in the Church? Why should she alone, which is a communion of individual believers, and something historical, yea the greatest fact and phenomenon of history, be made an exception to the laws of all organic life and development? The New Testament itself distinctly applies this law to the Church. For Christ compares his kingdom to a mustard seed which groweth into a mighty tree, and to a leaven which gradually leaveneth the whole lump, and the Apostles, especially St. Paul, speak continually of the growth of the body of Christ as well as of individual believers.

Even Roman Catholic Divines, such as Mühler and Newman, must resort to the idea of development in some form—whether

this naturally follows from the Roman standpoint of stability or not, is another question*—in order to understand and explain the history of their own Church. Much less can a Protestant historian advance a single step, and justify the Reformation, without the torchlight of this idea. It is now determined, as before remarked, that Protestantism in those doctrines differing from Catholicism, is not the Christianity of the Schoolmen and Mystics, not the Christianity of the Church Fathers of the Nicene age, not the Christianity of the Apologists, of the Apostolic Fathers, of the Martyrs and Confessors of the second and third centuries, but that all these are substantially more closely related to the Catholic standpoint, although this itself had only gradually developed and perfected itself. This is placed beyond doubt already, by the character of the Greek Church, which remains stationary at the point of the Ancient Church, and is evidently far more Catholic than Protestant. The doctrine of the Trinity, of the Divinity of Christ, of the Relation of the two Natures in Christ, of the Atonement, in short all the articles of the Apostolic and Nicene creeds, are here not brought into view; for these are not specifically and exclusively Protestant, but in their origin and substance Catholic, and manifestly inherited from an earlier Catholicism, fully as much so as the canon of Scripture and the doctrine of Inspiration. They constitute the primitive foundation common to all orthodox Churches, in opposition to all heretical sects. If then the Reformation is not a work of Satan, but a divine fact, which we for good reasons believe, it must be viewed and defended as a *new phase* in the progressive development of Protestantism, as an *advance* on the earlier periods of the history of the Church.

This is then the last but safe anchor for a Protestant divine of the German historical school. To this position has, for example, Dr. *Nevin* been forced, who is thoroughly acquainted with all the forms of English and German Protestantism. The Puritan, Presbyterian and Anglican historical hypotheses, have proved wholly untenable to him, and in his late articles

* Brownson, in several articles of his Review, violently opposes Newman's theory of development as subversive to Catholicism and Christianity, and predicts that a new and dangerous heresy will spring out of this view of the Anglican converts, unless it be speedily condemned by the authorities of the Roman Church. We believe that Brownson is very unjust to Newman, personally and perhaps unconsciously influenced by jealousy against his most distinguished fellow-convert; at the same time, however, we agree with him, that the idea of development is not congenial to the genuine spirit of Romanism, but essentially of Protestant growth.

on "Early Christianity" and "Cyprian," in the *Mercersburg Review*, he has produced arguments against them, which none of his many dissatisfied opponents have attempted to refute, and which indeed, in a historical view, so far as the main facts are concerned, can scarcely ever be refuted.* Consequently there remains for him nothing except the German theory of Development, which, in the mean time, is held in reproach by almost all English theologians. As long as he adheres to this theory, an exodus to Rome will be impossible, as it would be a retrogression, and consequently a nullification of the fundamental law of historical development. For this, in the nature of the case, implies progress, an advance from the lower to the higher, and this must hold good when applied to the Church, although in the individual parts of all the divisions of the Church, retrogressive movements and temporary stagnation may occur.

For the purpose, however, of justifying Protestantism satisfactorily, on the ground of the development theory, two important points must be settled. First, it must be proved that it was not a *radical* rupture with the religious life of the early, i. e., the Catholic Church, but that it has, *in common with her a primitive Christian and a primitive Church basis*, which we, in our opposition, should never lose sight of. For, in the course of her development, the Church must yet continually remain identical in her nature, and dare not advance beyond herself, without falling into heresy, and thus make the promise of Christ to her of none effect. Thus man from childhood to old age still remains man, and each successive step is but a higher evolution of the idea contained already in the infant. Hence it is of immense importance, that the Reformers with-

* It is a fact by no means creditable to our American theology, that the many and earnest writings of this distinguished divine on the Church question, in its various aspects, have been met almost on every side with misrepresentation, slander and abuse, instead of earnest, solid argument. The only respectable articles, which have thus far appeared against Dr. Nevin, are Dr. Hodge's review of the "Mystical Presence," and two articles of Dr. Proudfit in the *Princeton Review*, and even the latter ones are by no means free from misrepresentation, and escape the real points at issue. We hope for the honor of Puritanism, Presbyterianism and Anglicanism, that they will be able and willing to defend themselves in a truly scholarly and gentlemanly way against the powerful attacks made upon them from that quarter, which, however, in our estimation, could only be done by assuming a much more historical and at the same time far less bigoted and exclusive position than they have occupied heretofore. Unhistorical and unchurchly Protestantism, we apprehend, cannot stand ultimately against the powerful strides of Romanism, which has now fairly entered into the very heart of Anglo-American Protestantism, with renewed energy and the boldest hopes of final success.

out exception retained the Catholic Canon of Scripture, the ancient ecumenical symbols, and especially the Apostle's Creed, and incorporated them in their own confessions, and that they stood in direct opposition to the ultra Protestant sects of their times. Certain portions of modern Protestantism manifest, indeed, a fearful tendency in their bitter hostility against Rome, to separate themselves from this fundamental basis, and in like proportion sink into the character of heresies and sects. But the main branches of Protestantism will, by no means, surrender this Apostolic symbol, which connects them with the Ancient Church, and never cease to claim an interest in the Christianity before the Reformation, especially in the Patristic literature. Indeed there are evidently manifold strivings to recover numerous treasures, which have been cast overboard, and particularly to reconstruct, enlarge and conform their worship to the Church principle.

Then again it must be proved that Protestantism has its foundation substantially in *Apostolical* Christianity. For the New Testament, the Word of Christ and his inspired organs, is, after all, the final resort in all religious questions, and whatever has no connecting point with it cannot be sustained in the end. The germs of all legitimate stages of progress must already appear in the Apostolic Church, whilst a development beyond Christ himself and his Apostles, in the sense of Rationalists and Free-thinkers of all classes, must naturally assume the character of a degeneration, and a relapse into Heathenism or Judaism. With *such* development we, of course, have not the least sympathy whatever, but abhor it as essentially antichristian. But the Reformers, we all know, without exception placed themselves on the Bible as the only infallible rule of Christian faith and practice. Now it would indeed be an inextricable historical riddle, if the close association which Protestantism has from the start formed with the Bible, and if the zeal with which it continually devotes itself to its translation, interpretation and promulgation throughout the world, should rest finally upon a mere delusion. It is, indeed, manifestly impossible for the Bible to contain *all* that the various denominations and sects imagine to find in it—but which, in truth, they force into it, by means of their private interpretation—or it would contradict itself, and cease to be the truth any longer. It cannot possibly contain at once the contrary doctrines of Episcopalianism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Zuinglianism, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Methodism, the Baptists and Quakers, (if by special indulgence, we

should still number the last two with orthodox Protestantism); it cannot, at the same time, teach and condemn the doctrine of Predestination, or both affirm and deny the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; it cannot at one time declare Baptismal Regeneration, and yet degrade the Sacrament to the level of an empty sign; it cannot enjoin the baptism of Infants, and yet reject it as unchristian; it cannot establish three orders in the Ministry, and then again, but one, or teach no peculiar spiritual office at all, but only a universal Priesthood, and favor whatever other points of difference there may be in Doctrine, Constitution and Cultus, partly essential, partly non-essential, concerning which Protestants have quarreled already for three hundred years, with equally zealous appeal to the Bible, without advancing a single step towards each other. Still justice requires us to allow, that they agree, we will not say in all—as this would evidently be saying too much—but in most of the fundamental articles of the Gospel; for if it were otherwise, we would, according to the incontrovertible maxim, “out of the Church, no salvation,” be compelled to deny the possibility of salvation in one or the other of these communions, to which extent, even the extreme Puseyites, and Old-Lutherans will not venture.

Some such relation then must evidently exist between the Bible and orthodox Protestantism in order to explain intelligently their close connection for three hundred years. In this dilemma, German Theology again comes to our relief and transfers us, to what appears to us, the only correct point of view.

Modern exegetical investigations, in which sphere, as is well known, it has displayed an extraordinary activity, place it beyond all doubt for us at least, that we must distinguish three stages of development and types of doctrine in the apostolic Church, which of course, in no way, contradict or exclude each other, as the school of Dr. Baur in Tübingen, after the precedence of the ancient Gnostics, maintains, but mutually complete each other, to wit:—*Jewish Christianity*, represented by the Apostles, Peter and James, *Gentile Christianity*, represented by the Gentile Apostle Paul and his co-laborers, and *the higher union of both* by John, the beloved disciple, who, surviving all his colleagues, exhibits the third and last period and completion of the Apostolic Church, and looks forward, at the same time, as the Prophet of the new covenant, through the most distant future, to the new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace for evermore. If this view be correct—and we find it more and more confirmed the longer

we study the New Testament in its proper connection—we have a polar star to guide us through the entire labyrinth of Church History, in her manifold phases and stages of development. According to this view then, the history of the Catholic Church, which stays herself on Peter as her rock,* and derives her doctrine on justification, faith and good works chiefly from the first two Gospels and from the Epistle of James, corresponds to Apostolic Jewish Christianity, and with it lays stress principally on authority, law and the closest possible connection with the theocracy of the Old Testament. Protestantism, which originally proceeded from a renewed study of the Epistles of Paul, is a onesided enforcing of the paulino-Gentile Christianity with its spirit of evangelical freedom and independence, over against the Jewish Christian excesses. In its relation to Catholicism it has thus far imitated St. Paul far more in his temporary inimical collision with Peter at Antioch, (Gal. 2: 11, 19,) than in his subsequent friendly co-operation with him, and has frequently given occasion to his antagonist to repeat the warning of Peter against the abuse of the writings of Paul “in which there are some things hard to be understood.” (2 Peter 3: 16.) Then again Protestantism has unfolded thus far almost exclusively the anthropological and soteriological doctrines of Paul, his Epistles to the Galatians and Romans; whilst the later Epistles of the same Apostle, especially his profound doctrine of the Church, as the one, undivided body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all, have evidently not yet received their full share of attention. As soon as this shall be done, there will be at the same time a certain approximation to the Catholic church-principle, and the way become prepared for the third and last Period of the Christian Church, in which the great truths of Catholicism and evangelical Protestantism, with the exclusion of their mutual errors, may become united in a higher union and harmony, through the renewal and complete appropriation of the spirit of John, especially of his doctrine of the person of Christ, and the living communion of the faithful with Him and with each other. But this union must be preceded by a universal

* We may admit with Count Zinzendorf, and Dr. Stahl, in his late address to the German Church Diet in Bremen, that “the Pope is not the Antichrist, but the legitimate chief of the Roman Church,” as Peter was the head of Jewish Christianity, without surrendering thereby the true interests of Protestantism. For the Roman Church is not the Catholic Church, but only a part of it. The Greek Church in her best days never disputed the authority and even primacy of the Bishop of Rome for the Latin Church, but refused to submit to it in the absolute and universal sense.

repentance, and we may here appropriate to ourselves the significant words of the great and generous Catholic Divine, Möhler (Symbolik, Page 353, sq. 6 Ed.,) who, after frankly acknowledging the unwarrantable lack of principle in so many priests, bishops and Popes, "whom hell has swallowed up," as the cause of corruption in his Church and of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, adds—"This is the point (the consciousness of guilt) at which Catholics and Protestants will in great multitudes one day meet and give each other the hand of friendship. Both, conscious of guilt, must exclaim, *We all have erred—it is the Church only—as an institution of Christ—which cannot err; we all have sinned—the Church alone is spotless on earth.* This open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation."

Herewith we bring the series of essays on German Theology to a close. We have rendered it high praise, and joined bright hopes with it. But we would not be so misunderstood, as though we were blind to its manifold wants and imperfections; we have rather distinctly stated the contrary, and intimated that its principle practical task has by no means yet been accomplished. We know also full well that salvation comes not from theology, science or learning, under any form, as many German closet-scholars imagine, but from *life*, from those *divine-human powers*, those aged, yet ever youthful *supernatural facts*, which alone have founded and which alone can renew and complete the Church. But if the evangelical theology of Germany, in connection with the other instruments of the age, should, in the hands of a merciful God, serve the purpose of preparing the way, from the Protestant side, through the inward, quiet, yet deeply working "power of thought," for such a reconciliation between Catholicism and Protestantism, and aid in bringing to an end the great schism of the sixteenth century by a greater and more difficult act of reunion: it would truly deserve the praise and gratitude of all true friends of the kingdom of God, which is a kingdom of love, harmony and peace. For what can be more grand and glorious than to heal the bleeding wounds of the body of Christ, and to labor for the realization of the last prayer of our Eternal High Priest: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me!"

W.

Meroersburg, December 6th, 1852.